

169574

THE
WORLD'S CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS

THE ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

DELIVERED

BEFORE THE PARLIAMENT,

AND

AN ABSTRACT OF THE CONGRESSES

HELD IN THE ART INSTITUTE.

Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.,

AUGUST 25 TO OCTOBER 15, 1893.

Under the Auspices of

THE WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

PROFUSELY ILLUSTRATED.

WITH MARGINAL NOTES


EDITED BY J. W. HANSON, D. D.

*"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."*—POPE

W. W. HOUSTON & CO.,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

1894

vol. 2



R M I C LIBRARY	
Acc. No. 469574	
Class No.	89.9.23
Date	8.9.93
St. Card	Cl.
Class	✓
Cat.	✓
Bk. Card	Sg.
Checked	3a

Presented by Sri R. K Dasgupta.



Mrs. Eliza R. Sunderland, Ph. D., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Importance of the Study of Comparative Religions.

Paper by MRS. ELIZA R. SUNDERLAND, PH. D., of Ann Arbor, Mich.



Y theme bears the impress of the nineteenth century—the century par excellence in scientific research and classification, which has given us the new heavens of the telescope, the spectroscope and stellar photography; the new earth of geology, chemistry, mineralogy, botany and zoology, and the new humanity of ethnology, philology, psychology and hierology.

But the nineteenth century is only the high tide of that medieval renaissance which aroused the mind of Europe from its long slumber, hanging in its sky a banner bearing only a mighty interrogation point with the words "By this sign conquer." Under the lead of this banner the medieval church was challenged to give reason why each individual soul should not inquire and decide freely for itself in matters of religion, and the Protestant reformation resulted. The old established monarchies of Europe were asked to give reason why the many should live and toil and die for the few, and modern republicanism was born.

Earth, and air and sea were asked to give reason why man should not enter into his birthright of ownership of all physical nature, and steamship and steam car, telegraph and telephone came as title deeds to man's sovereignty.

Man's Sovereignty.

Onward moves the victorious banner, and collective humanity is asked to show its face and give reason why it is black, and brown, and white; to produce its languages and give reasons for such infinite variety; to draw aside the curtain from its holy of holies, pronounce its most sacred names, recount its myths, recite its mythologies, ex-



plain its symbols, describe its rites, sing its hymns, pray its prayers and, finally, give up its life history of origins and transformations. Such in brief is the work of the nineteenth century.

What is the value of this work? I am asked to respond only for one department of it, namely, that of hierology, or the comparative study of religions.

Value and
Importance.

What is the value and importance of a comparative study of religions? What lessons has it to teach? I may answer, first, that the results of hierology form part of the great body of scientific truth, and as such have a recognized scientific value as helping to complete a knowledge of man and his environment; and I shall attempt to show that a serious study by an intelligent public of the great mass of facts already gathered concerning most of the religions of the world will prove of great value in at least two directions—first, as a means of general, second, as a means of religious culture. Matthew Arnold defines culture as "the acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world and thus with the history of the human spirit." This is a nineteenth century use of the word.

The Romans would have used instead "*humanitas*," or, with an English plural, "*the humanities*," to express a corresponding thought. The schoolmen, adopting the Latin term, limited its application to the languages, literature, history, art and archæology of Greece and Rome, assuming that thither the world must look for the most enlightening and humanizing influences, and, in their use of the word, contrasting these as human products with "*divinity*" which completed the circle of scholastic knowledge. But the world of the nineteenth century is larger than that of medieval Europe, and we may well thank Mr. Arnold for a new word suited to the new times. Culture—acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world and thus with the history of the human spirit. This will require us to know a great body of literature; but when we inquire for the best we shall find ourselves confronted by a vast mass of religious literature. Homer was a great religious poet; Hesiod, also. The central idea in all the great dramas of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides was religious, and no one need hope to penetrate beneath the surface of any of these, who lacks a sympathetic acquaintance with the religious ideas, myths and mythologies of the Greeks. Dante's "*Divine Comedy*," Milton's "*Paradise Lost*" and Goethe's "*Faust*" are religious poems, to read which intelligently one must have an acquaintance with medieval mythology and modern Protestant theology.

Then there are the great Bibles of the world, the Christian and Jewish, the Mohammedan and Zoroastrian, the Brahman and Buddhist and the two Chinese sacred books. It is of these books that Emerson sings:

Out of the heart of nature rolled
The burden of the Bible old;
The litanies of nations came,
Like the volcano's tongue of flame,
Up from the burning core below,
The canticles of love and woe.

He who would be cultured in Matthew Arnold's sense of being acquainted with the history of the human spirit must know these books, and this means a patient, careful study of the growth and development of rites, symbols, myths and mythologies, traditions, creeds and priestly orders through long centuries of time, from far away primitive nature worship up to the elaborate ritual and developed liturgy which demanded the written book.

But religion is a living power and not, therefore, to be confined to book or creed or ritual. All these, religion called into being, and is itself, therefore, greater than any or all of them. So far from being confined to book and creed and ritual, religion has proved, in the words of Dr. C. P. Tiele, "one of the most potent factors in human history; it has founded and overthrown nations, united and divided empires; has sanctioned the most atrocious deeds and the most cruel customs; has inspired beautiful acts of heroism, self-renunciation and devotion, and has occasioned the most sanguinary wars, rebellions and persecutions. It has brought freedom, happiness and peace to nations, and, anon, has proved a partisan of tyranny; now calling into existence a brilliant civilization, then the deadly foe to progress, science and art." All this is a part of world history, and the student who ignores it or passes over lightly the religious motive underlying it is thereby obscuring the hidden causes which alone can explain the outer facts of history.

A Living
Power.

Again, the human spirit has ever delighted to express itself in art. True culture, therefore, requires a knowledge of art. But to know the world's art without first knowing the world's religions would be to read Homer in the original before knowing the Greek alphabet. Why the vastness and gloom of the Egyptian temples? the approaches to them through long rows of sphinxes? What mean these sphinxes and the pyramids, the rock-hewn temple tombs and the obelisks of ancient Egyptian art? Why the low, earth-loving Greek temple, with all its beauty and external adornment? What is the central thought in Greek sculpture? Why does the medieval cathedral climb heavenward, with its massive towers and turrets?

What is the meaning of the tower temples of ancient Assyria and Babylon and the mosques and minarets of western Asia? All are symbols of religious life, and are blind and meaningless without an understanding of that life. Blot out the architecture and sculpture whose motive is strictly religious, and how great a blank remains? Painting and music, too, have been the handmaidens of religion, and cannot be mastered in their full depths of meaning save by one who knows something of the religious ideas and sentiments which gave them birth; eloquence has found its deepest inspiration in sacred themes; and philosophy is only the attempt of the intellect to formulate what the heart of man has striven after and felt.

Let a student set himself the task of becoming intelligent concerning the philosophic speculations of the world, and he will soon find that among all peoples the earliest speculations have been of a

Earliest Speculations.

religious nature, and that out of these, philosophy arose. If, then, he would understand the development of philosophy, he must begin with the development of the religious consciousness in its beginnings in the Indo-Germanic race, the Semitic race, and in Christianity. As Dr. Pfeiderer shows in his "Philosophy of Religion on the Basis of Its History:"

"There could have been no distinct philosophy of religion in the ancient world, because nowhere did religion appear as an independent fact, clearly distinguished alike from politics, art and science. This condition was first fulfilled in Christianity. But no philosophy of religion was possible in medieval Christianity, because independent scientific investigation was impossible. All thinking was dominated either by dogmatism or by an undefined faith."

If the germs of a philosophy of religion may be found in the theosophic mysticism and the anti-scholastic philosophy of the renaissance, its real beginnings are to be found not earlier than the eighteenth century. But what a magnificent array of names in the two and a quarter centuries since Spinoza wrote his theologico-political treatise in 1670. Spinoza, Leibnitz, Lessing, Kant, Herder, Goethe, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Schelling, Hegel, and, if we would follow the tendencies of philosophic religious thought in the present day, Feuerbach, Comte, Strauss, Mill, Spencer, Matthew Arnold, Hermann, Schopenhauer, Von Hartmann, Lotze, Edward Caird, John Caird and Martineau. No student, who aspires to an acquaintance with philosophy, can afford to be ignorant of these thinkers and their thoughts; but to follow most intelligently the thought of any one of them he will need a preliminary acquaintance with hierology through such careful, painstaking conscientious work in the study of different religions as has been made by such scholars as Max Müller, C. P. Tiele, Keunen, Ernest Renan, Albert Reville, Prof. Robertson Smith, Renouf, La Saus saye and Sayce.

If religious thought and feeling is thus bound up with the literature, art and philosophy of the world, not less close is its relation to the language, social and political institutions and morals of humanity. It is sacred names quite as often as any other words which furnish the philologist his links in the chain of proofs of relationship between languages. It does not need a Herbert Spencer to point out that political institutions and offices are frequently related to religion as effect to cause; the king's touch and the doctrine of divine right of kings are only survivals from the days of the medicine man and heaven-born chief.

The question concerning the relations of religion to ethics is a living one in modern thought. One class of thinkers insists, that ethics is all there is of religion that can be known or can be of value to man; another, that ethics, if lived, will of necessity blossom out into religion, since religion is only ethics touched with emotion; another, that religion and ethics are two distinct things which have no necessary relation to each other; and still others maintain that there is

no high and persistent moral life possible without the sanctions of religion, and no high and worthy religion possible without an accompanying high morality; that whatever may be true in low conditions of civilization, any religion adapted to high civilizations must be ethical, and any ethical precepts or principles which are to helpfully control men's lives must be rooted in faith. A wide and careful study of the world's religions ought to throw light upon the problem.

Such a study would point to the conclusion that, though differing greatly among themselves in other ways, all religions, even the oldest and poorest, must have shown some faint traces at least of awakening moral feeling. From an early period moral ideas are combined with religious doctrines, and the old mythologies are modified by them. Ethical attributes are ascribed to the gods, especially the highest. Later, but only in the higher nature religions, ethical as well as intellectual abstractions are personified and worshiped as divine beings.

Moral Ideas.

What are the historic facts in the case? Have religion and morality had a contemporaneous development, and in conjunction? or has the history of the two run on distinct and divergent lines? Who shall answer authoritatively save the student of the history of religions? Let us question some such. "All religions," says C. P. Tiele, "are either race religious or religions proceeding from an individual founder; the former are nature religions; the latter ethical religions. In the nature religions the supreme gods are the mighty powers of nature, and though there are great mutual differences between them, some standing on a much higher plane than others, the oldest and poorest must have shown some faint traces, at least, of awakening moral feeling. In some a constant and remarkable progress is also to be noticed. Gods are more and more anthropomorphized, rites humanized. From an early period moral ideas are combined with religious doctrines and the old mythologies are modified by them. Ethical attributes are ascribed to the gods, especially to the highest. Nay, ethical as well as intellectual abstractions are personified and worshiped as divine beings. But, as a rule, this happens only in the most advanced stages of nature worship. Nature religions can for a long time bear the introduction into their mythologies of moral as well as æsthetic, scientific and philosophical notions; and they are unable to shut them out, for if they did so they would lose their hold upon the leading classes among the more civilized nations.

"If, however, the ethical elements acquire the upper hand so that they become the predominating principle, then the old forms break in twain by the too heavy burden of new ideas, and the old rites being useless, become obsolete. Then nature religion inevitably dies of inanition. When this culminating point has been reached the way is prepared for the preaching of an ethical religious doctrine.

"Ethical religions are communities brought together, not by a common belief in national traditions, but by the common belief in a doctrine of salvation, and organized with the aim of maintaining, fostering, propagating and practicing that doctrine. This fundamental doctrine

A Doctrine of
Salvation.

is considered by its adherents in each case as a divine revelation, and he who revealed it, an inspired prophet or son of God."

The ethical religions Tiele divides into national, or particularistic and universalistic. The latter, three in number, are the dominant religions in the world today. Of these, Islamism has emphasized the religious side, the absolute sovereignty of God, opposing to it the nothingness of man, and has thus neglected to develop morals. "Buddhism, on the contrary, neglects the divine, preaches the final salvation of man from the miseries of existence through the power of his own self-renunciation, and as it was atheistic in its origin it soon becomes infected by the most fantastic mythology and the most childish superstitions. Christianity in its founder did full justice to both the divine and human sides; if the greatest commandment was love to God, the second was like unto it, viz., love to man. Such is a brief resume of C. P. Tiele's account of the mutual historical relations of ethics and religion.

Albert Reville devotes a chapter of his "Prolegomena to the History of Religions" to the same question. He finds that morality, like religion, began very low down and rose very high; that with morality, as with religion, we must recognize in the human mind a spontaneous disposition *sui generis*, arising from its natural constitution, destined to expand in the school of experience, but which that school can never create.

With the entrance of moral prepossessions into religion, life beyond the tomb becomes a place of divine rewards, and thus originates a new chapter of religious history. Under monotheism the connection between religion and morality becomes still closer. Here everything, the physical world, human society, human personality, has but one all-powerful master. Moral order is his work by the same right and as completely as physical order. Obedience to the moral law becomes then essentially a religious duty. Consequently, the religious ideal rises and becomes purified at the same time as the moral ideal. We may even say that, in the Gospel, religion and morality are no longer easily to be distinguished; upon the basis of the monotheistic principle and the affinity of nature between man and God, the religion of Jesus moves on independently of dogma and of rite, consisting essentially of strictly moral provisions and applications.

"Has morality gained or lost by this close alliance with religion?" asks Reville; and answers: "In a general way we may say that the characteristic of the religious sentiment, when it is associated with another element of human life, is to render this element much more intense and more powerful. From this simple observance we have the right to conclude that as a general rule morality gains in attractiveness, in power and in strength by its alliance with religion."

True, unenlightened religion has sometimes perverted the moral sense and reduced morality to a utilitarian calculation. Most of the religions which have assigned a large place to morality have founded on the rock of asceticism, especially Brahmanism, Buddhism and

the Christianity of the Middle Ages. Religion has sometimes failed to distinguish between morality and ritual, or morality and occult belief, and we have the spectacle of a punctilious observer of rites considered to be more nearly united to God, notwithstanding terrible violations of the moral law, than is the good man who fails in ritual or creed. And yet, Reville concludes from the individual point of view: "The question which the spiritual tribunal of each of us is alone qualified to decide is, whether we ought not to congratulate the man who derives from his religious convictions, freed from narrowness, from utilitarianism and from superstition, the source, the charm and the vigor of his moral life. Persuaded that for most men the alliance between religion and morality cannot but be salutary, I must pronounce in the affirmative."

Observer of
Rites.

If the conclusions of all students of hierology shall prove in harmony with the views here expressed as to the close connection in origin and in history, between morality and religion, a connection growing closer as each rises in the scale of worth, until we find in the very highest the two indissolubly united, may we not conclude a wise dictum for our modern life to be "what God in history has joined together let not man in practice put asunder?" Rather let him who would lift the world morally avail himself of the motor power of religion; let him who would erect a temple of religion see to it that its foundations are laid in the enduring granite of character.

I come now to the second division of my subject, namely, the value of hierology as a means of religious culture.

What is religion? Ask the question of an ordinary communicant of any religious order and the answer will in all probability, as a rule, emphasize some surface characteristic.

The orthodox Protestant defines it as a creed; the Catholic, a creed plus a ritual—believe the doctrines and observe the sacraments; the Mohammedan as a dogma; the Buddhist as an ethical system; the Brahmin as caste; the Confucian as a system of statecraft. But let the earnest student ask further for the real meaning to the worshiper, of his ritual, creed, dogma, ethics, caste and ethics-political, and he will find each system to be a feeling out after a bond of union between the human and the divine; each implies a mode of activity, a process by which the individual spirit strives to bring itself into harmonious relations with the highest power, will, or intelligence. Each is of value in just so far as it is able to inaugurate some felt relation between the worshiper and the superhuman powers in which he believes. In the language of philosophy, each is a seeking for a reconciliation of the ego and the non-ego.

What is Re-
ligion.

The earnest student will find many resemblances between all these communions; his own included. They all started from the same simple germ; they have all had a life history which can be traced, which is in a true sense a development, and whose laws can be formulated; they all have sought outward expression for the religious yearning and have all found it in symbol, rite, myth, tradition, creed. The result

of such a study must be to reveal man to himself in his deepest nature; it enables the individual to trace his own lineaments in the mirror and see himself in the perspective of humanity. Prior to such study, religion is an accident of time and place and nationality; a particular revelation to his particular nation or age, which might have been withheld from him and his, as it was withheld from the rest of the world, but for the distinguishing favor of the Divine Sovereign of the universe in choosing out one favored people and sending to that one a special revelation of His will.

An Attribute
of Humanity

After such study religion is an attribute of humanity, as reason and language and tool-making are; needing only a human being placed in a physical universe which dominates his own physical life, which crubs and cabins him by its inexorable laws, and, lo! defying those laws he steps out into the infinite world of faith, of hope, of aspiration, of God. The petty distinctions of savage, barbarian, civilized and enlightened sink into the background. He is a man, and by virtue of his manhood, his human nature, he worships and aspires. A comparative study of religions furnishes the only basis for estimating the relative worth of any religion.

Many of you saw and perhaps shared the smile and exclamation of incredulous amusement over the paragraph which went the rounds of the papers some months ago to the effect that the Mohammedans were preparing to send missionaries and establish a Mohammedan mission in New York City. But why the smile and exclamation? Because of our sense of the superiority of our own form of religious faith. Yet Christianity has utterly failed to control the vice of drunkenness. Chicago today is dominated by the saloons. Nor is it alone in this respect. Christian lands everywhere are dotted with poorhouses, asylums, jails, penitentiaries, reformatories, built to try to remedy evils, nine-tenths of which were caused, directly or indirectly, by the drink habit which Christendom fails to control and is powerless to uproot. But Mohammedanism does control it in oriental lands. Says Isaac Taylor. "Mohammedanism stands in fierce opposition to gambling: a gambler's testimony is invalid in law." And further: "Islam is the most powerful total abstinence association in the world." This testimony is confirmed by other writers and by illustration. If it can do so on the western continent as well, then what better thing could happen to New York, or to Chicago even, than the establishment of some vigorous Mohammedan missions? And for the best good of Chicago it might be well that Mayor Harrison instruct the police that the missionaries are not to be arrested for obstructing the highway if they should venture to preach their temperance gospel in the saloon quarters.

Study of All
Religions.

But if a study of all religions is the only road to a true definition of religion and classification of religions, it is quite as necessary to the intelligent comprehension of any one religion. Goethe declared long ago that he who knows but one language knows none, and Max Müller applies the adage to religion. A very little thought will show the

truth of the application in either case. On the old time supposition that religion and language alike came down ready formed from heaven, a divine gift or revelation to man, this would not be true. Complete in itself, with no earthly relationships, why should it need anything but itself for its comprehension. But modern scientific inquiry soon dispels any such theories of the origin of language and religion alike. If the absolute origin of each is lost in prehistoric shadows, the light of history shows each as a gradual evolution or development, whose laws of development can to some extent be traced, whose history can be, partially at least, deciphered. But if an evolution, a development, then are both religion and language in the chain of cause and effect, and no single link of that chain can by any possibility be comprehended alone and out of relation to the links preceding and following.

Allow me to illustrate this proposition at some length. I am a Christian. I want to know the nature, meaning and import of the Christian religion. I find myself in the midst of a great army of sects all calling themselves Christians. I must either admit the claim of all, or I must prove that only one has right to the name, and to do either rationally I must become acquainted with all. But they absolutely contradict each other and some of them, at least, the original records of Christianity, in both their creed and ritual.

Here is one sect that holds to the unity of God; here another that contends earnestly for a Trinity; here one that worships at high altars with burning candles, processions of robed priests, elevation of the host, holy water, adoration of the Virgin Mother, and humble confessional, all in stately cathedrals, with stained-glass windows, pealing organ and surpliced choir; there another, which deems that Christianity is foreign to all such ritual, and whose worship consists in waiting quietly for an hour within the four bare walls of the quaker meeting-house to see if the inner voice hath ought of message from the great enlightening spirit.

How account for such differences when all claim a common source? Only by tracing back the stream of Christian history to its source and following each tributary to its source, thus, if possible, to discover the origin of elements so dissimilar. Seriously entered upon the quest, we discover here a stream of influence from ancient Egypt, "through Greece and Rome, bringing to Roman Catholic Christendom," so says Tiele, "the germs of the worship of the virgin, the doctrine of the immaculate conception and the type of its theocracy."

Another tributary brings in a stream of Neo-Platonism with its doctrine of the Word, or Logos; there a stream of Græco-Roman mythology with a deifying tendency so strongly developed that it will fall in adoration equally before a Roman emperor or a Paul and Cephas, whose deeds seem marvelous. Another stream from imperial Rome brings its gift of hierarchical organization, and here a tributary comes in from the German forests bringing the festivals of the sun god and the egg god of the newly developing life of spring. Christianity cannot banish these festivals; too long have they held place in the

All Claim a
Common
Source.

religious consciousness of the people. She can, however, and does adopt and baptize them, and we have the gorgeous Catholic festivals of Christmas and Easter.

Christianity itself sends its roots back into Judaism; hence, to know it really in its deepest nature, we must apply to it the laws of heredity, *i. e.*, we must study Judaism. Judaism has its sacred book, and our task will be easy, so we think. But a very little unbiased study will show us that Judaism is not one, but many. There is the Judaism which talks freely of angels and devils and the future life, happiness or misery, and there is the earlier Mosaism which knows nothing of angels or devils and of no future life save that of sheol, in which, as David declares, there is no service of God possible. Would we understand this difference we must note a tributary stream flowing in from Babylonia, and if we will trace this to its source we shall find its fountain head in the Persian dualism of Ormuzd and Ahriman, the god of light and the god of darkness, with their attendant angels. Only after the Babylonian captivity do we find in Judaism angels and a hierarchy of devils.

Pass back through the Jewish sacred books, and strange things will meet us. Here a "Thus saith the Lord" to Joshua; "Slay all the Canaanites, men, women and helpless children; I suffer not one to live;" "Sell the animal that has died of itself to the stranger within your gate, but not to those of your own flesh and blood." The Lord comes to dine with Abraham under the oak at Mamre on his way down to Sodom to see if the reports of its great wickedness be true, and discusses his plans with his host. Naaman must carry home with him loads of Palestinian earth if he would build an altar to the god of the Hebrews whose prophet has cured his leprosy.

The Lord guides the Israelites through the wilderness by a pillar of fire by night and of smoke by day, lives in the ark, and in it goes before the Israelites into battle; is captured in the ark and punishes the Philistines till they send Him back to His people. The Lord makes a covenant with Abraham, and it is confirmed according to divine command by Abraham slaying and dividing animals and the Lord passing between the parts, thus affirming His share in the covenant.

Is this the same God of whom Jesus taught? This the religion out of which sprang Christianity? How, then, account for the immense distance between the two? To do this we must trace the early Hebrew religion to its source and then follow the stream to the rise of Christianity, seeking earnestly for the causes of the transformation. What was the early Hebrew religion? A branch of the great Semitic family of religions. What was the religion of the Semites and who were the Semites? These questions have been answered in an exhaustive and scholarly manner, so far as he goes, by Prof. Robertson Smith in the volume entitled, "The Religion of the Semites," a volume to which no student of the Old Testament, who wishes to understand that rich treasury of oriental and ancient sacred literature, can afford not to give a serious study.

The Semites occupied all the lands of western Asia from the Tigro-Euphrates valley to the Mediterranean Sea. They included the Arabs, Hebrews and Phœnicians, the Aramæans, Babylonians and Assyrians. A comparative study of the religions of all these peoples has convinced scholars that all were developments from a common primitive source, the early religion of the Semites. This religion was first nature worship of the personified heavenly bodies, especially the sun and moon. Among the Arabs this early religion developed into animistic polydemonism, and never rose much higher than this; but among the Mesopotamian Semites the nature beings rise above nature and rule it, and one among them rises above all the others as the head of an unlimited theocracy.

If magic and augury remained prominent constituents of their ceremonial religion, they practiced, besides, a real worship and gave utterance to a vivid sense of sin, a deep feeling of man's dependence, even of his nothingness, before God, in prayers and hymns hardly less fervent than those of the pious souls of Israel. Among the western Semites, the Aramæans, Canaanites, Phœnicians seem to have sojourned in Mesopotamia before moving westward, and they brought with them the names of the early Mesopotamian Semitic gods, with the cruel and unchaste worship of a non-Semitic people, the Akkadians, which henceforth distinguished them from the other Semites. From the Akkadians, too, was probably derived the consecration of the seventh day as a Sabbath or day of rest, afterward shared by the Hebrews.

Maglo and
Augury.

The last of the Semitic peoples, the Hebrews, seem to be more closely related to the Arabs than to the northern or eastern Semites. They entered and gradually conquered most of Canaan during the thirteenth century, B. C., bringing with them a religion of extreme simplicity, though not monotheistic, and not differing greatly in character from that of the Arabs. Their ancient national god bore the name El-Shaddai, but his worship had given place under their great leader, Moses, to a new cult, the worship of Yahveh, the dreadful and stern god of thunder, who first appeared to Moses at the bush under the name "I am that I am," worshiped according to a new fundamental religious and moral law, the so-called Ten Words. Were this name and this law indigenous to Arabia or a special revelation, *de novo*, to Moses? But whence had Moses the moral culture adequate to the comprehension and appropriation of a moral system so far in advance of anything which we find among other early Semites? Nineteenth century research has discovered an equally high moral code in Egypt, and the very name "Nukpu Nuk," "I am that I am," is found among old Egyptian inscriptions.

Whatever its origin, this new religion the Hebrews did not abandon in their new home, although they placed their national god, Yahveh, by the side of the deity of the country, whom they called briefly "the Baal," and whom most of them worshiped together with Ashera, the goddess of fertility. After they had left their wandering life and

Their Nation-
al God.

settled down to agriculture, Yahveh, however, as the God of the conquerors, was commonly placed above the others, though his stern character was softened by that of the gentler Baal. Well for Israel and well for the world that these two conceptions of deity came together in Judea twelve centuries before Christ. If the worship of the jealous god Yahveh made the Jew stern and uncompromising, it also girded him with a high moral sense whose legitimate outcome was Israel's great prophets, while the fierceness itself, as gradually transformed by the gentler Baal conception of deity, gives us in the final outcome, the holy God who cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance and yet pitieth the sinner even as a father pitieth his children. If any have been perplexed over a religion of love such as Christianity claims to be, proving a religion of bloody wars, persecutions, inquisitions, martyrdoms, mayhap its Hebrew origin may throw light upon the mystery. Jesus' thought of a God, a Father, could not wholly displace at once the old Hebrew Yahveh, the jealous God.

All the Semitic religions, while differing among themselves in the names and certain characteristics of their deities, had much in common. Their gods were all tribal or national gods, limited to particular countries, choosing for themselves special dwelling places, which thus became holy places, usually near celebrated trees or living water, the tree, rock or water often coming to be regarded not simply as the abode, but as in some sense, the divine embodiment or representative of the god, and hence these places were chosen as sanctuaries and places of worship; though the northern Semitic worshiped on hills also, the worship consisted, during the nomadic period, in sacrifices of animals sacred alike to the god and his worshipers, because sharing the common life of both, and to some extent of human sacrifices as well. The skin of the animal sacrificed is the oldest form, says Robertson-Smith, of a sacred garment appropriate to the performance of holy function, and was the origin of the expression "robe of righteousness." Is this the far-away origin of the scarlet robe of office?

All life, whether the life of man or beast, within the limits of the tribe, was sacred, being held in common with the tribal god, who was the progenitor of the whole tribal life; hence, no life could be taken, save in sacrifice to the god, without calling down the wrath of the god. Sacrifices thus became tribal feasts, shared between the god and his worshipers, the god receiving the blood poured upon the altar, the worshipers eating the flesh in a joyful tribal feast.

Here, then, was the origin of the Hebrew religion. It was not monotheistic, but what scholars designated as henotheistic, a belief in the existence of many gods, though worshiping only the national god. Thus, a man was born into his religion as he was born into his tribe, and he could only change his religion by changing his tribe. This explains Ruth's impassioned words to Naomi, "Thy people shall be my people and thy God my God." This idea of the tribal god, who is a friend to his own people but an enemy to all others, added to the belief in the inviolability of all life save when offered in sacrifice,

explains the decree that an animal dying of itself might not be eaten by a tribesman, but might be sold to a stranger. A tribal god, too, might rightfully enough order the slaughter of the men, women and children of another tribe whose god had proved too weak to defend them. Life was sacred only because shared with the god, and this sharing was limited to the tribe.


The Hebrew people moved onward and upward from this early Semitic stage and have left invaluable landmarks of their progress in their sacred books. The story of the sacrifice of Isaac tells of the time when human sacrifices were outgrown. Perhaps circumcision does the same. The story of Cain and Abel dates from the time when agriculture was beginning to take the place of the old nomadic shepherd life. The men of the new calling were still worshipers of the old gods, and would gladly share with them what they had to give—the fruits of the earth. But the clingers to the old life could see nothing sacred in this new thing, and were sure that only the old could be well pleasing to their god.

The god who dined with Abraham under the terebinth tree, at Mamre, was the early tribal god, El-Shaddai. Naaman was cured of his leprosy because the Jordan was sacred to the deity. It was the thunder god, Yahveh, whom the people worshiped on Sinai and who still bore traces of the earlier sun god as he guided the people in a pillar of fire. The ark is a remnant of fetichism, *i. e.*, a means of putting the deity under control of his worshipers. They can compel his presence on the battlefield by carrying the ark thither, and if the ark is captured the god is captured also.

A powerful element in the upward development of Mosaism was prophecy. The eighth century prophets had moved far on beyond the whole sacrificial system, when, as spokesman for the Lord, Isaiah exclaims: "I am tired of your burnt sacrifices and your oblations. What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with thy God." Jesus condemns the whole theory of holy places when he declares: "Neither in this holy mountain nor yet in Jerusalem shall men think to worship God most acceptably." God is a spirit unlimited by time or place, and they who would worship acceptably must worship in spirit and in truth.

How long the journey from the early tribal sacrificial, magical, unmoral, fetich, holy place, human sacrifice worship of the early Semites, including the Hebrews, to the universal fatherhood and brotherhood religion of the Sermon on the Mount and the golden rule, only those can understand who are willing to give serious study not to the latter alone, but to the former as well. To such earnest student there will probably come another revelation, namely, that there is need of no miracle to account for this religious transformation more than for the physical transformation from the frozen snows of December to the palpitating life of June. They are both all miracle or none. The great infinite life and love was hidden alike in the winter clod and the human sacrifice. Given the necessary conditions and the frozen clod

Infinite Life
and Love.



has "climbed to a soul in grass and flowers," the tribal god and the tribal blood bond are seen in their real character as the universal God Fatherhood and man brotherhood. What the necessary conditions were, only those shall know who are ready to read God's thoughts after Him in the patient researches of scientific investigation.

What is to be the future of this religion which has had so long and varied a history from far away Akkad even to this center of the western hemisphere, and from twenty centuries before Christ to this last decade of the nineteenth century after Christ?

One contribution made by the Hebrew to the Christian Scriptures demands special notice because it occupies so central a place in the development of the Christian system. I refer to the record of a first man, Adam, a Garden of Eden, a fall, an utter depravity resulting, and ending in a universal flood; a re-beginning and another fall and confounding of speech at Babel. The founder of Christianity never refers to these events and the Gospels are silent concerning them. Paul first alludes to them, but in his hands and those of his successors they have become central in the theology of Christendom. Whence came this record of these real or supposed events? Genesis is silent concerning its origin. The antiquary delving among the ruins of ancient Chaldea finds almost the identical record of the same series of events upon clay tablets which are referred to an Akkadian people, the founders of the earliest civilization of the Tigro-Euphrates valley, a people not Semitic, but Turanian, related, therefore, to the great Turanian peoples represented by the Chinese, Japanese and Fins.

We started out to make an exhaustive study of Christianity, an Aryan religion if named from its adherents; Semitic from its origin. We found it receiving tributary streams from three Aryan sources, namely, Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, Pagan Rome and Teutonic-Germany; its roots were nurtured in Semitic Hebrew soil which had been enriched from Semitic Assyria, Aryan Persia, Turanian Akkadia and Hematic Egypt.

Its parent was Judaism, a national religion, limited by the boundaries of one nation. It is itself a universal religion, having transcended all national boundaries. How was this transformation effected? For answer go to Kuenen's masterly handling of the subject, "National Religions and Universal Religions." If our study has been wide we have learned that religions, like languages, have a life history of birth, development, transformation, death, following certain definite laws. Moreover, the law of life for all organisms is the same, and may, perhaps, be formulated as the power of adjustment to environment; the greater the adjustability the greater the vitality.

Capacity to Change. But this means capacity to change. "That which is no longer susceptible of change," says Kuenen, "may continue to exist, but it has ceased to live. And religion must live, must enter into new combinations and bear fresh fruit if it is to answer to its destiny; if refusing to crystallize into formulæ and usages it is to work like the leaven, is to console, to inspire and to strengthen." Has Christianity this vital

power? "Yes," again answers Kuenen, and quotes approvingly a saying of Richard Rothe: "Christianity is the most mutable of all things. That is its special glory." And why should this not be so? Christianity has gathered contributions from many lands and woven them into one ideal large enough to include all peoples, tender enough to comfort all, lofty enough to inspire all—the ideal of a universal human brotherhood bound together under a common Divine Fatherhood.



The Comparative Study of the World's Religions.

Paper by MGR. C. D. D'HARLEZ, Louvain University.



It is not without profound emotion that I address myself to an assemblage of men, the most distinguished, come together from all parts of the world and who, despite essential divergences of opinion, are nevertheless united in this vast edifice, pursuing one purpose, animated with one thought, the most noble that may occupy the human mind, the seeking out of religious truth. I have under my eyes this unprecedented spectacle, until now unheard of, of disciples of Kong-fu-tse, of Buddha, of Brahma, of Ahura Majda, of Arah, of Zoroaster, of Mohammed, of Naka-nusi, of Laotze, not less than those of Moses and of the divine Christ, gathered together, not to engage in the struggle of hostility, of animosity, sources of sorrow and griefs, but to hold up before the eyes of the world the beliefs which they profess and which they have received from their fathers and their religion.

Religion! Word sublime. Full of harmony to the ear of man, penetrating on through the depths of his heart and stirring into vibration its profoundest chords.

Final Happiness of Man.

How goodly the title of our programme—World's Parliament of Religions. How true the thought put forth by one who took part in its production: "Comparison, not controversy, will best serve the most wholesome and therefore the most divine truth." Parliament. It is in such an assembly that the most weighty interests of humanity are discussed, that their most accredited representatives come to set forth what they believe to be most favorable to their development, to their legitimate satisfaction. But in this parliament of religions it is not the world that is the question, but heaven—the final happiness of man.

Let me speak of the importance of a serious study of all systems of religion. But first let us ask if it is useful, if it is good, to give one's self to this study. This is in effect the question which in Europe men of faith put themselves when this new branch suddenly sprouted forth from the trunk of the tree of science. At first it inspired only repugnance, or at least great distrust, and this was not without reason. The opinions, the designs of those who made themselves its promoters inspired very legitimate suspicions. It was evident that the end pursued was to confound all religions as works of human invention, to put them all upon a common level, in order to bring them all into common contempt.

The comparative history of religions in the minds of their originators was to be an exposition of all the vicissitudes of human thought, imagination, and, to say the real word, folly. It was to be Darwinism, evolution applied to religious conditions that were generally held as coming from God. Naturally, then, a large number of the enlightened faithful, some of them eminent minds, saw only evil and danger in the new science. Others, clearer of sight, better informed on prevailing ideas, on the needs of the situation, convinced, besides, that a divine work cannot perish, and that providence disposes of things for the greater good of humanity, welcomed without reserve this new child of science, and by their example, as by their words, drew with them into this new field of research even the hesitating and trembling. They thought, besides, that no field of science should, or could, be interdicted to men of faith without placing them and their belief in a state of inferiority the most fatal, and that to abandon any one of them whatever would be to hand it over to the spirit of system and to all sorts of errors. They judged that any science, seriously controlled in its methods, can only concur in bringing about the triumph of the truth, and that eternal truth must come forth victorious from every scientific discussion, unless its defenders, from a fear and mistrust injurious alike for it and its divine author, abandon it and desert its cause.

Eternal Truth.

Today the most timid Christian, be he ever so little in touch with the circumstances of the times, no longer dreads in the least the chimerical monsters pictured to his imagination at the dawn of these new studies, and follows, with as much interest as he formerly feared, the discoveries which the savants lay before him. What study today excites more attention and interest than the comparative study of religions? What object more pre-occupies the mind of men than the one contained in that magic word?

Religion! In Christian countries--and this qualification embraces the whole of Europe, with the exception of Turkey and all of America--three classes of men may be distinguished by their dispositions and attitudes toward religious questions. Some possess the truth descended from on high, study it, search into its depths with love and respect; others, at the very opposite pole, animated by I do not know what spirit, wage against it an incessant warfare and do their utmost to stifle it; others, in fine, ranged between these two extremes, plunged

into doubt, ask themselves, thanklessly, what there is in these truths which they see on the one hand exalted with enthusiasm and on the other attacked with fury. In no way formed by education to submit their intelligence to dogmas which they cannot understand nor to regulate their conduct by inflexible moral precepts, hearing, however, within them a voice which calls upon them to rise above themselves, they are cast about upon the sea of doubt and anguish in vain demanding of the earth the bond to cure the evil from which their hearts suffer.

Yes, this voice whispers to their ears the most redoubtable problems that ever man proposed. Whence comes he? Who has placed him upon this earth? Whither does he go? What is his end? What must he do to secure it? Immense horizons of happiness or of misery open out before him. How manage to avoid the one and reach the other?

Long did men seek to stifle the whispered murmurings of conscience. It has triumphed over all resistance. Today more than ever, as it has been so energetically said, "Man is homesick for the divine." The divine! The unbeliever has sought to drive it out through every pass. It has come back more triumphant than ever. So today souls, not enlightened by the divine light, feel an indefinable uneasiness such as that experienced by the aeronaut in the superterrestrial region of rarified atmosphere, such as that of the heart when air and blood fail. Those who confine themselves to earthly pursuits feel even in the midst of success that something is still wanting; that is, whatever they say and whatever they do man has not only a body to nourish and an intelligence to cultivate and develop, but he has, I emphatically affirm, a soul to satisfy. This soul, too, is in incessant travail, in continual evolution toward the light and the truth. As long as she has not received all light and conquered all truth, so long will she torment man.

Something
still Wanting.

Those aspirations, those indefinable states of the soul in the presence of the dreaded unknown, today so common in our midst, are without doubt not unknown in the regions of Asia and Africa. There, too, rationalism, agnosticism, imported from Europe, has made its inroads. But on the other hand, such incertitude is not entirely new. Twenty-five centuries ago the Vidist poet proposed the very problems which today perplex the unbeliever, as we see in the celebrated hymn thought to be addressed to a god, Ka, the fruit of the imagination of interpreters, since this word, Ka, was merely an interrogative used by the singer of the Ganges in asking what hand had laid the foundation of the world, upon whom depended life and death, who upheld the earth and the stars, etc., questions to which the poet could give only this reply, sad avowal of impotence: Kavais Ko Viveda. "Sacred chanters, who knows."

We see from these short extracts to what a height the reformer of Evan had already raised himself, and how his eye had already caught a glimpse of many of the mysteries of the metaphysical and moral world; how, besides, his soul was agitated and troubled, looking

up to that heaven which sent him no light. At the other extremity of the world the greatest philosopher that China has produced, or rather the greatest moralist, whose lessons she has preserved, Kong-fu-tze, or, as we call him, Confucius was bearing witness to the impotence of the mind of man to penetrate the secrets of heaven. To the question which his disciples proposed as to the condition of the soul on leaving this world, he replied by this despairing evasion: "We do not even know life; how can we know death?" How many souls at all times, and in all parts of the world, have been tortured by the same perplexities. What age has ever counted more than ours?

It has been said with incontestible truth that history is the great teacher of peoples and of kings; religious principles the most assured cannot guide us in all the acts of national life, many of which lie beyond religious control. But history is not composed of a series of facts succeeding one another at hazard. It is the work, direct or indirect, of God, and according to the divine purpose ought certainly to serve for the instruction of humanity. Now, among all the matters of which history treats, is there a single one which, I will not say surpasses, but equals, yes, even approaches, by the elevation of its object and the importance of its results, the history of religious opinions and precepts along through the ages?

History the
Great Teacher.

If, then, the facts of the earthly temporal life of humanity teach it lessons which it ought to store by with care in order to profit by them and direct its actions, what fruits will it not have to gather in from the happenings of its supernatural and immortal life? What dangers it will escape, remembering the faults and errors of former generations whose fatal consequences have been evils innumerable!

Does not man there learn only to resist that fever of ambition, source of so many innovations, useless or hurtful to the peace of the world, that pride which thinks to have found the solution of problems the most abstruse, the key to unlock the very heavens, if I may so speak, and which burns to propagate mere fruits of the imagination at the risk of seeing the world ablaze, does not man, I say, reach but this one conclusion, that the fruits of our studies ought to be held at just so much value as they are prolific in beneficial results.

Besides, nothing is more proper to enlarge the intellectual horizon, to give of every matter a just appreciation, which cuts off irreflective enthusiasm as well as unjustifiable prejudices. It teaches not to attribute to one's self the monopoly of what others equally possess and thus to employ argument whose recognized fallacy injures enormously the cause one would defend. From history, too, each one requires a more reasonable and scientific knowledge of his own belief.

What unlimited horizons these studies unfold before our eyes! Where better learn to know the nature of the human mind, its powers and their limitations, its weaknesses, with their varied causes, than in this great book of the history of religions? What could better unveil to the eyes of the man of faith the action of that providence which leads him in the midst of continual agitations and disposes of what he

has proposed, the power of the arm invisible and invincible which chastises him for his faults by his own mistakes and lifts him up, saves him from the perils which he has brought upon himself when he recognizes his weakness and his frailty?

Problem admirable and fearful, this providential commission of the strangest intellectual adorations! What a spectacle, that of man plunging into an abyss of error and misery because he has wished to march alone to the conquest of truths beyond his reach!

When we see a whole people prostrating themselves before the statue of a monarch whose mortal remains will be soon under ground, the prey of the worms or enveloping with the fumes of their incense, honoring with their homages the figure of a low animal which has to attract notice only its brutal instincts, its strength and cruelty, who would not implore of heaven delivering light to save humanity from degradation so profound and so entirely debasing?

Clear and Rational Belief.

True, it is often most difficult to follow the designs of Providence in their execution throughout the ages, but it is not always impossible to divine, to guess at the secret. Have not the excesses of Greco-Roman polytheism, for example, been committed in order to lead man to a clearer and more rational belief? Its shameless immorality to make him desire a higher life?

It is evident, on the other hand, that in this kind of appreciation it is necessary to take special count of civilized peoples, of those whose intelligence has attained a certain degree of development, and only very little of those unfortunate tribes which have hardly anything more of man than the bodily form. I come, then, to consider the important side of the study of religion, that is to say, the results it has to the present day produced, and what it is called upon to produce in the future.

How many points cleared up in a few years, thanks to the control exercised upon the first explorers in this field by those who came after them, and who had no ready-made system to defend! This is specially true for two concepts, upon which we shall principally dwell, the nature of religion and its origin. What is it that has not been said upon these great questions? It has, in fact, been demonstrated that religion is not a creation of the mind of man, still less of a wandering imagination deceived by phantoms, but that it is a principle which imposes itself upon him everywhere and always and in spite of himself, which comes back again violently into life at the moment it was thought to be stifled, which, try as one may to cast it off from him, enters again as it were into man by his every pore.

There is no people without a religion, how low soever it may be in the scale of civilization. If there be any in whom the religious idea seems extinct, though this cannot be certainly shown, it is because their intelligence has come to that degree of degradation in which it has no longer anything human save the capacity of being lifted to something higher. The explanations that have been offered of the religious sentiment inborn in man might be qualified as "truly curious and amusing were it not a question of matters so grave."

For some it is unreflecting instinct. Be it so; but wherever came this instinct? Doubtless from nature. And nature, what is it? It is reality, as we have said. True instinct does not deceive. For others, religion arises from the need man experiences of relationship with superior beings. Correct again; but how has man conceived the notion of beings superior to himself if there are none, and whence arises that natural need which his heart feels, if it has its roots in nothing, a non-entity *Ex nihilo' nihil*, from nothing, nothing comes. Shall I speak of the "celestial harmony which charms the soul and lifts it into an ideal world," of "those visions which float through the imagination of man," and of other like fancies? No, it would be to waste inconsiderately the time of my honored hearers too precious to be taken up by such trifles. Let us merely note this fact fully attested today. Religious sentiments and concepts are innate in man. They enter into the constitution of his nature, which itself comes from its author and master; they impose themselves as a duty upon man, as the declaration of universal conscience attests. The idea of a being superior to humanity, its master, comes from the very depths of human nature and is rendered sensible to the intellect by the spectacle of the universe. No reasonable mind can suppose that this vast world has of itself created or formed itself. This is so true that men of science, the most hostile to religion, the moment they perceive some evidence of design upon a stone, however deeply imbedded in the earth, themselves proclaim that man has passed here.

Religious
Sentiment In-
born in Man.

"It is fear that hath made the gods," said a Latin poet, already two thousand years ago. No, say others, it is a mere tendency to attribute a soul to whatever moves itself. You are mistaken, says a third; it is reverence for deceased ancestors which caused their descendants yet remaining upon earth to regard them as superior beings. You are all astray, exclaims a fourth voice; a religion does not arise from any one or other of these or like causes in particular, but from all taken together. Fear, joy, illusions, nocturnal visions, the movements of the stars, etc., have all contributed something, each its own part.

It is not our task to set forth these different opinions, still less to criticise them. We cannot, however, pass in silence, till of late universally in vogue in the free-thinking camp, a system whose foundations historical studies have uprooted. I speak of the theory which has borrowed its process from the Darwinian system of evolution, the system of perpetual progress. If you would believe its authors and defenders, primitive humanity have no religious sentiment, not the least notion that raised it above material nature. But, feeling in himself a living principle, man attributed the same to whatever moved about him, and thence arose fetichism and animism.

Uprooted by
Historical
Studies.

After the first stage of fetichism and animism man would have considered separately the living principles of the beings to which he had attributed it, and this separation would have given rise to the belief in spirits. These spirits, growing upon the popular imagination, would have become gods, to whom, ultimately, after the fashion of

earthly empires, they would have given a head. These gods would have at first been exclusively national, then a universal empire would have been imagined, and national religions would have at length ended as a last effort of the human mind in universal religions.

A Grain of
Truth Want-
ing.

Here, indeed, we have an edifice wonderfully planned and perfectly constructed. This would appear still more plainly were we to describe in detail all its parts. Unfortunately, one thing is wanting—one thing only, but essential—that is a little grain of truth. Not only is the whole of it the fruit of hypothesis without foundation in facts, but religious studies have demonstrated all and each of its details to be false.

The examples of Egypt, of India and of China, especially, have demonstrated that monotheism real, though imperfect, preceded the luxuriant mythologies whose development astonishes, but is only too easily explained. In Egypt the divinity was first represented by the sun; the different phases of the great luminary were personified and deified. In the most ancient portions of Aryan India the personality of Varuna, with his immutable laws, soars above the figures of Indra and the other devas who have in great part dethroned him, just as the Jupiter of Greece supplanted the more ancient Pelagian Ouranos. Among these two last people, it is true, monotheism is at its lowest degree; but in China, on the contrary, it shows itself much less imperfect than elsewhere and even with relative purity. Shang-ti is almost the God of the spiritualist philosophy. These facts, we may easily conceive, are exceedingly embarrassing for the adherent of the evolutionary theory, but they worm out of the difficulty in a manner that provokes both sadness and a smile. The thesis of national divinities everywhere preceding the universal divinities is not more solidly grounded. For neither Varuna nor Brahma nor Shang-ti nor Tengri ever saw their power limited by their devotees to a single country. The theory that fear or ancestral worship gave birth to the gods received in China the most formal contradiction. In fact, at the very first appearance of this first great empire upon the scene of history, the supreme deity was already considered as the father, the mother, not only of the faithful, but of the entire human race, and the first to receive worship among the dead were not departed relatives but kings and ministers, benefactors of the people. That it is gratitude which has inspired this worship is expressly affirmed in the Chinese ritual.


It remains for us to say a few words about these conditions. The first is clearly that enunciated in our program. These studies ought to be serious and strictly scientific. They should be based upon strict logic and a thorough knowledge of the original sources. Too long have would-be adepts been given over to fantastic speculations, everywhere seeking an apology for either faith or incredulity. Too long have they limited themselves to superficial views, to summary glimpses, dwelling with complacency upon whatever might favor a pet system. Or else they have been content with documents of second hand whose authors themselves had but an imperfect knowledge of who they pretended to treat as masters.

We may easily understand that in order to be able to choose among them all, and to distinguish the sources, it is necessary to know thoroughly the language and the history, both political and literary, of the people whose religions one would investigate and expose. It is necessary to be a specialist and a specialist competent in this special matter. It is only when the work of such authorized and impartial specialist has been done, the others will be able to draw from the waters which they have collected. How many errors fatal to true science have been propagated by men too prone to generalize?

This leads us to consider the second condition for the serious study of the comparative history of religion. It is the necessity of penetrating one's self with the spirit of the people who form the object of particular research. It is necessary, as it were, to think with their minds and to see with their eyes, making entire abstraction of one's own ideas, under pain of seeing everything in a false light as one sees nature through a colored glass and of forming of foreign religious ideas the most erroneous and often even the most unjust.

To Think
with Their
Minds.





Mission House, Upper Congo, Africa.
By permission of Mr. Wm. S. Cherry.

Swedenborg and the Harmony of Religions.

Paper by REV. L. P. MERCER, of Chicago.



BEFORE the closing of this grand historic assembly with its witness to the worth of every form of faith by which men worship God and seek communion with Him, one word more needs be spoken, one more testimony defined, one more hope recorded.

Every voice has witnessed to the recognition of a new age. An age of inquiry, expectation and experiment has dawned. New inventions are stirring men's hearts, new ideals inspire their arts, new physical achievements beckon them on to one marvelous mastery after another of the universe. And now we see that the new freedom of "willing and thinking" has entered the realm of religion, and the faiths of the world are summoned to declare

and compare not only the formulas of the past but the movements of the present and the forecasts of the future.

One religious teacher, who explicitly heralded the new age, before men had yet dreamed of its possibility, and referred its causes to great movements in the centers of influx in the spiritual world, and described it as incidental to great purposes in the providence of God, needs to be named from this platform—one who ranks with prophets and seers rather than with inquirers and speculators; a revelator rather than a preacher and interpreter; one whose exalted personal character and transcendent learning are eclipsed in the fruits of his mission as a herald of a new dispensation in religion, as the revealer of heavenly arcana, and "restorer of the foundations of many generations;" who, ignored by his own generation, and assaulted by its successor, is honored and respected in the present, and awaits the thoughtful study, which the expansion and culmination of the truth and the organic course of events, will bring with tomorrow; "the permeating and formative influence" of whose teachings in the religious belief and life of today, in Christendom, is commonly admitted; who subscribed

A Revelator
Rather than a
Preacher.


with his name on the last of his Latin quartos—Emanuel Swedenborg, "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Ahead of His
Generation.

That Swedenborg was the son of a Swedish bishop, a scholar, a practical engineer, a man of science, a philosopher and a seer, who lived between 1683 and 1772, is generally known. That the first fifty years of his remarkable life, devoted to the pursuit of natural learning and independent investigation in science and philosophy, illustrates the type of man in which our age believes is generally conceded. Learned, standing far ahead of his generation; exact, trained in mathematical accuracy and schooled to observation; practical, seeing at once some useful application of every new discovery; a man of affairs, able to take care of his own and bear his part in the nation's councils; aspiring, ignoring no useful application, but content with no achievement short of a final philosophy of causes; inductive, taking nothing for granted but facts of experiment, and seeking to ascend therefrom to a generalization which shall explain them—this is the sort of man which in our own day we consider sound and useful. Such was the man who, at the age of fifty-six, in the full maturity of his powers, declares that "he was called to a holy office by the Lord, who most graciously manifested himself to me in person, and opened my sight to a view of the spiritual world and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels." "From that day forth," he says, "I gave up all worldly learning, and labored only in spiritual things according to what the Lord commanded me to write."

He tells us that, while in the body, yet in a state of seership, and thus able to note the course of events in both worlds, and locate the stupendous transactions in the spiritual world in earthly time, he witnessed a last judgment in the world of spirits in 1757, fulfilling in every respect the predictions in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse; that he beheld the Lord open in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself, revealing in their eternal sense the divine meaning, the whole course and purpose of His providence, organizing a new heaven of angels out of every nation and kindred and tongue, and co-ordinating it with the ancient and most ancient heavens for the inauguration of a new dispensation of religion, and of the church universal; and that this new dispensation began in the spiritual world, is carried down and inaugurated among men by the revelation of the spiritual sense and divine meaning of the sacred Scriptures, in and by means of which he makes his promised second advent, which is spiritual and universal, to gather up and complete all past and partial revelations, to consummate and crown the dispensations and churches which have been upon the earth.

The Christian world is incredulous of such an event, and for the most part heedless of its announcement. But that does not much signify, except as it makes one with the whole course of history, as to the reception of divine announcements. What prophet was ever welcomed until the event had proved his message? The question is not whether it meets the expectation of men; not whether it is what



human prudence would forecast, but whether it reveals and meets the needs and necessities of the nations of the earth. "My thoughts are not your thoughts," saith the Lord, "neither are your ways my ways." The great movements of divine Providence are never what men anticipate, but they always provide what men need. And the appeal to the Parliament of Religions, in behalf of the revelation announced from heaven, is in its ability to prove its divinity by outreaching abundantly all human forecast whatsoever. Does it throw its light over the past, and into the present, and project its promise into the future? Does it illuminate and unify history, elucidate the conflicting movements of today, and explain the hopes and yearnings of the heart in every age and clime?

There is not time at this hour for exposition and illustration, only to indicate the catholicity of Swedenborg's teachings in its spirit, scope and purpose. There is one God and one church. As God is one, the human race, in the complex movements of its growth and history, is before Him as one greatest man. It has had its ages in their order corresponding to infancy, childhood, youth and manhood in the individual. As the one God is the Father of all, He has witnessed Himself in every age according to its state and necessities. The divine care has not been confined to one line of human descent, nor the revelation of God's will to one set of miraculously given Scriptures.

Catholicity of
Swedenborg's
Teachings.

The great religions of the world have their origin in that same word or mind of God which wrote itself through Hebrew lawgiver and prophet, and became incarnate in Jesus Christ. He, as "the word which was in the beginning with God and was God," was the light of every age in the spiritual development of mankind, preserving and carrying over the life of each into the several streams of tradition in the religions of men concerning and embodying all in the Hebrew Scriptures, fulfilling that in His own person, and now opening His divine mind in all that Scripture, the religions of the world are to be restored to unity, purified and perfected in Him.

Nor is this word Swedenborgian, the liberal sentiment of good will and the enthusiasm of hope, but the discovery of divine fact and the rational insight of spiritual understanding. He has shown that the sacred Scriptures are written according to the correspondence of natural with spiritual things, and that they contain an internal spiritual sense treating of the providence of God in the dispensations of the church and of the regeneration and spiritual life of the soul. Before Abraham there was the church of Noah, and before the word of Moses there was an ancient word, written in allegory and correspondences, which the ancients understood and loved, but in process of time turned into magic and idolatry. The ancient church, scattered into Egypt and Asia, carried fragments of that ancient word and preserved something of its representatives and allegories, in Scriptures and mythologies, from which have come the truths and fables of the oriental religions, modified according to nations and peoples, and revived from time to time in the teachings of leaders and prophets.

From the same ancient word Moses derived, under divine direction, the early chapters of Genesis, and to this in the order of Providence was added the Law and the Prophets. The history of the incarnation and the prophecy of a final judgment of God, all so written as to contain an integral spiritual sense, corresponding with the latter, but distinct from it as the soul corresponds with the body, and is distinct and transcends it. It is the opening of this internal sense in all the Holy Scriptures and not any addition to their final letter which constitutes the new and needed revelation of our day. The science of correspondences is the key which unlocks the Scriptures and discloses their internal contents. The same key opens the Scriptures of the orient and traces them back to their source in primitive revelation.

If it shows that their myths and representatives have been misunderstood, misrepresented and misapplied, it shows, also, that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures have been likewise perverted and falsified. It is that very fact which necessitates the revelation of their internal meaning, in which resides their divine inspiration and the life of rational understanding for the separation of truth from error. The same rational life and science of interpretation separates the great primitive truths from the corrupting speculations and traditions in all the ancient religions, and furnishes the key to unlock the myths and symbols in ancient Scriptures and worship.

Key to Myths
and Symbols.

If Swedenborg reveals errors and supersitions in the religions out of Christendom, so does he also show that the current Christian faith and worship is largely the invention of men and falsifying of the Christian's Bible. If he promises and shows true faith and life to the Christian from the Scriptures, so does he also to the Gentiles in leading them back to primitive revelation and showing them the meaning of their own aspirations for the light of life. If he sets the Hebrew and Christian word above all other sacred Scripture, it is because it brings, as now opened in its Scriptural depths, the divine sanction to all the rest and gathers their strains into its sublime symphony of revelation.

So much as the indication of what Swedenborg does for catholic enlightenment in spiritual wisdom. As for salvation, he teaches that God has provided with every nation a witness of Himself and means of eternal life. He is present by His spirit with all. He gives the good of His love, which is life, internally and impartially to all. All know that there is a God, and that He is to be loved and obeyed; that there is a life after death, and that there are evils which are to be shunned as sins against God. So far as anyone so believes and so lives from a principle of religion he receives eternal life in his soul, and after death instruction and perfection according to the sincerity of his life.

No teaching could be more catholic than this, showing that "whomsoever in any nation feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." If he sets forth Jesus Christ as the only wise God, in

whom, is the fullness of the Godhead, it is Christ glorified, and realizing to the mind the infinite and eternal lover, and thinker, and doer, a real and personal God, our Father and Saviour. If he summons all prophets and teachers to bring their honor and glory unto Him it is not as to a conquering rival, but as to their inspiring life, whose word they have spoken and whose work they have wrought out. If he brings all good spirits in the other life to the acknowledgment of the glorified Christ as the only God, it is because they have in heart and essential faith, believed in Him and lived for Him, in living according to precepts of their religion. He calls him a Christian who lives as a Christian; and he lives as a Christian who looks to the one God and does what He teaches, as he is able to know it. If he denies reincarnation, so also does he deny sleep in the grave and the resurrection of the material body.

If he teaches the necessity of regeneration and union with God, so also does he show that the subjugation and quiescence of self is the true "Nirvana," opening consciousness to the divine life and conferring the peace of harmony with God.

If he teaches that man needs the spirit of God for the subjugation of self, he teaches that the spirit is freely imparted to whosoever will look to the Lord and shun selfishness as sin. If he teaches thus, that faith is necessary to salvation, he teaches that faith alone is not sufficient, but faith which worketh by love.

If he denies that salvation is of favor, or immediate mercy, and affirms that it is vital and the effect of righteousness, he also teaches that the divine righteousness is imparted vitally to him that seeks it first and above all; and if he denies that several probations on earth are necessary to the working out of the issues of righteousness, it is because man enters a spiritual world after death, in a spiritual body and personality, and in an environment in which his ruling love is developed, his ignorance enlightened, his imperfections removed, his good beginnings perfected, until he is ready to be incorporated in the grand Man of heaven, to receive and functionate his measure of the divine life and participate in the divine joy. And so I might go on.

My purpose is accomplished if I have won your respect and interest in the teachings of this great apostle, who, claiming to be called of the Lord to open the Scriptures, presents a harmony of truths that would gather into its embrace all that is of value in every religion and open out into a career of illimitable spiritual progress.

All that is of
Value in Religion.

The most unimpassioned of men, perhaps because he so well understood that his mission was not his own, but the concern of Him who builds through the ages, Swedenborg wrote and published. The result is a liberty that calmly awaits the truth-seekers. If the religions of the world become disciples then, it will not be proselytism that will take them there, but the organic course of events in that providence which works on, silent but mighty, like the forces that poise planets and gravitate among the stars.

Present history shows the effect of unsuspected causes. This par-

liament of religions is itself a testimony to unseen spiritual causes, and should at least incline to belief in Swedenborg's testimony, that a way is open, both in the spiritual world and on earth, for a universal church in the faith of one visible God in Whom is the invisible, imparting eternal life and enlightenment to all from every nation who believe in Him and work righteousness.



Harmonies and Distinctions in the Theistic Teachings of the Various Historic Faiths.

Paper by PROF. M. VALENTINE.



IN calling attention to the "Harmonies and Distinctions in the Theistic Teachings of the Various Historic Faiths," I must, by very necessity of the case, speak from the Christian standpoint. This standpoint is to me synonymous with the very truth itself. I cannot speak as free from prepossessions. This, however, does not mean any unwillingness nor, I trust, inability to see and treat with sincerest candor and genuine appreciation the truth that may be found in each and all of the various theistic conceptions which reason and Providence may have enabled men anywhere to reach. Undoubtedly, some rays from the true divine "Light of the World" have been shining through reason, and reflected from "the things that are made" everywhere and at all times, God never nor in any place leaving Himself wholly without witness. And though we now and here stand in the midst of the high illumination of what we accept as supernatural revelation, we rejoice to recognize the truth which may have come into view from other openings, blending with the light of God's redemptive self-manifestation in Christianity. 169571

It is not necessary prejudice to truth anywhere when from this standpoint I am further necessitated, in this comparative view, to take the Christian conception as the standard of comparison and measurement. We must use some standard if we are to proceed discriminately or reach any well defined and consistent conclusions. Simply to compare different conceptions with one another, without the unifying light of some accepted rule of judging, or at least of reference, can never lift the impression out of confusion or fix any valuable points of

Standard for
Consistent Con-
clusions.

The Truth
Clearly Seen.

truth. Only to hold our eye to the varied shifting colors and combinations of the kaleidoscope can bring no satisfactory or edifying conclusion. To the Christian's comparative view of the "historic faiths" other than his own necessarily thus ranges them under his own Christian canons of judgment, means no exclusion or obscuration of the light, but merely fixes the leading parallelism of its fall, securing consistency and clearness of presentation, a presentation under which not only the harmonies and distinctions, but the actual truth, may be most clearly and fairly seen.

The phrase "theistic teaching," in the statement of the subject of this paper, I understand, in its broadest sense, as referring to the whole conception concerning God, including the very question of His being, and therefore applicable to systems of thought, if any such there be, that in philosophic reality are atheistic. In this sense teachings on the subject of Deity or "the divine" are "theistic," though they negative the reality of God, and so may come legitimately into our comparative view. And yet, we are to bear in mind, it is only the "theistic" teaching of the historic faiths, not their whole religious view, that falls under the intention of this paper. The subject is special, restricting us specifically to their ideas about God.

Theistic Faiths
of Men.

At the outset we need to remind ourselves of the exceeding difficulty of the comparison, or of precise and firm classification of the theistic faiths of mankind. They are all, at least all the ethnic faiths, developments or evolutions, having undergone various and immense changes. Their evolutions amount to revolutions in some cases. They are not permanently marked by the same features, and will not admit the same predicates at different times. Some are found to differ more from themselves in their history than from one another. There is such an inter-crossing of principles and manifold forms of representation as to lead the most learned specialists into disputes and opposing conclusions, and render a scientific characterization and classification impossible. The most and best that can be done is to bring the teachings of the historic religions in this particular into comparison as to five or six of the fundamental and most distinctive features of theistic conception. Their most vital points of likeness and difference will thus appear. It will be enough to include in the comparison, besides Christianity, the religions of ancient Greece and Rome, of old Egypt, Indian Hinduism or more exactly Brahmanism, Persian Parsecism or Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Chinese Confucianism, Celtic Druidism, the Norse or Teutonic mythology and Mahommedanism, with incidental reference to some less prominent religions. I class Judaism as the early stage of unfolding Christianity.

Adopting this method, therefore, of comparing them under the light of a few leading features or elements of the theistic view, we begin with that which is most fundamental—belief in the existence of God, or of what we call "the divine," Deity, some higher power to which or to whom men sustain relations of dependence, obligation and hope. This is the bottom point, the question underlying all other questions

in religious belief: Does a God exist? And here it is assuring; a wonderful harmony is found. All the historic faiths, save perhaps one, rest on belief of some divine existence or existences to be acknowledged, feared or pleased. It seems to be part of the religious instinct of the race. And the intellect concurs in fostering and developing the belief. History, ethnology and philology not only suggest, but amply prove, that the idea of God, of some power or powers above, upon whom man depends and to whom he must answer, is so normal to human reason in the presence and experience of the phenomena of nature and life, that it is developed wherever man's condition is high enough for the action of his religious nature at all.

"God" is the fundamental and constructive idea, and it is the greatest and most vital idea of humanity. But the harmony of the world's religious faiths in this positive theistic teaching is, according to prevailing interpretation, broken in the case of Buddhism. This appears to be atheistic, a religion, or rather a philosophy, of life, without a deity or even the apotheosis of nature. Many things, however, incline me to the view of those interpreters who deny, or at least doubt, the totally atheistic character of Buddhism. For instance, it is rooted in the earlier pantheistic Hindu faith, and has historically developed a cult with temples and prayers. In the face of these and other things, only the most positive evidence can put its total atheism beyond question. Gautama's work of reform, which swept away the multitudinous divinities of the popular theology, may not have been a denial of God, even as Socrates alleged atheism was not, but rather an overthrow of the prevalent gross polytheism in the interest of a truer and more spiritual conception, though it may have been a less definite one of the divine being.

The Fundamental and Constructive Idea.

And may we not justly distinguish between Buddhism as a mere philosophy of life or conduct and Buddhism as a religion, with its former nature-gods swept away, and the replacing better conception only obscurely and inadequately brought out? At least it is certain that its teaching was not dogmatic atheism, a formal denial of God, but marked rather by the negative attitude of failing positively to recognize and affirm the divine existence. The divergence in this case is undoubtedly less of a discord than has often been supposed. There are cases of atheism in the midst of Christian lands, the outcome of bewilderment through speculative philosophies. They may even spread widely and last long. They, however, count but little against the great heart and intellect of mankind, or even as giving a definite characteristic to the religion in the midst of which they appear. And they lose sway, even as the Buddhist philosophy, in becoming a religion that has had to resume recognition of deity. And it is something grand and inspiring that the testimony of the world's religions from all around the horizon and down the centuries is virtually unanimous as to this first great principle in theistic teaching. It is the strong and ceaseless testimony of the great deep heart and reason of mankind. Nay, it is God's own testimony to His being, voiced through the religious nature and life made in His image.

Discordantly
Polytheistic.

But let these various religions be compared in the light of a second principle in theistic teaching—that of monotheism. Here it is startling to find how terribly the idea of God, whose existence is so unanimously owned, has been misconceived and distorted. For, taking the historic faiths in their fully developed form, only two, Christianity and Mohammedanism, present a pure and maintained monotheism. Zoroastrianism cannot be counted in here, though at first its Ahriman, or evil spirit, was not conceived of as a God, it afterward lapsed into theological dualism and practical polytheism. All the rest are pre-eminently and discordantly polytheistic. They move off into endless multiplicity of divinities and grotesque degradations of their character. This fact does not speak well for the ability of the human mind without supernatural help, to formulate and maintain the necessary idea of God worthily.

This dark and regretful phenomenon is, however, much relieved by several modifying facts. One is, that the search-lights of history and philology reveal for the principal historic faiths back of their stages and conditions of luxuriantly developed polytheism the existence of an early or possibly, though not certainly, primitive monotheism. This point, I know, is strongly contested, especially by many whose views are determined by acceptance of the evolutionist hypothesis of the derivative origin of the human race. But it seems to me that the evidence, as made clear through the true historical method of investigation, is decisive for monotheism as the earliest known form of theistic conception in the religions of Egypt, China, India and the original Druidism, as well as of the two faiths already classed as asserting the divine unity.

Polytheisms are found to be actual growths. Tracing them back they become simpler and simpler. "The younger the polytheism the fewer the gods," until a stage is reached where God is conceived of as one alone. This accords, too, as has been well pointed out, with the psychological genesis of ideas—the singular number preceding the plural, the idea of a god preceding the idea of gods, the affirmation, "There is a God," going before the affirmation there are two or many gods.

Another fact of belief is, that the polytheisms have not held their fields without dissent and revolt. Over against the tendency of depraved humanity to corrupt the idea of God and multiply imaginary and false divinities, there are forces that act for correction and improvement. The human soul has been formed for the one true and only God. Where reason is highly developed and the testing powers of the intellect and conscience are earnestly applied to the problems of existence and duty, these grotesque and gross polytheisms prove unsatisfactory.

In the higher ascents of civilization faith in the mythologic divinities is undermined and weakened. Men of lofty genius arise, men of finer ethical intuitions and higher religious sense and aspiration and better conceptions of the power by and in which men live and

move are reached and a reformation comes. This is illustrated in the epoch-making teachings of Confucius in China, of Zoroaster in Persia, of Gautama in India and of Socrates, Plato, Cicero and kindred spirits in ancient Greece and Rome. In their profounder and more rational inquiries these, and such as these, have pierced the darkness and confusion and caught sure vision of the one true eternal God above all gods, at once explaining the significance of them all and reducing all but the one to myths or symbols. Polytheism, which has put its stamp so generally on the historic faiths, has not held them in undisputed, full, unbroken sway.

Taking these modifying facts into account, the testimony of these faiths to the unity of God is found to be far larger and stronger than at first view it seemed. For neither Christianity, with its Old Testament beginning, nor Mohammedanism, has been a small thing in the world. They have spoken for the divine unity for ages, and voiced it far through the earth. And unquestionably the faith of the few grand sages, the great thinkers of the race, who, by "The world's great altar stairs that slope through darkness up to God," have risen to clear views of the sublime, eternal truth of the divine unity, is worth ten thousand times more, as an illumination and authority for correct faith, than the ideas and practice of the ignorant and unthinking millions that have crowded the polytheistic worships.

But of the two found, purely monotheistic Christianity has unique characteristics. Its witness is original and independent, not derived as that of Islam, which adopted it from Judaic and Christian teaching. It is trinitarian, teaching a triune mystery of life in the one infinite and eternal God, as over against Islam's repudiation of this mystery. The trinities detected in the other religions have nothing in common with the Christian teaching save the use of the number three. And it stands accredited, not as a mere evolution of rational knowledge, a scientific discovery, but as a supernatural revelation, in which the Eternal One Himself says to the world: "I am God, and beside Me there is none."

Unique Char-
acteristics.

But we pass to another point of comparison in the principle of personality. Under this principle the religions of the world fall into two classes—those which conceive of God as an intelligent being, acting in freedom, and those that conceive of Him pantheistically as the sum of nature or the impersonal energy or soul of all things. In Christian teaching God is a personal being with all the attributes or predicates that enter into the concept of such being. In the Christian Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments this conception is never for a moment lowered or obscured. God, though immanent in nature, filling it with His presence and power, is yet its creator and preserver, keeping it subject to His will and purposes, never confounded or identified with it. He is the infinite, absolute personality.

The finding of this feature of teaching in the other historic religions depends on the period or stage of development at which we take them. In the polytheistic forms of all grades of development we are bewil-

dered by the immense diversity in which, in this particular, the objects of worship are conceived, from the intense anthropomorphism that makes the gods but mighty men or apotheosized ancestors, down through endless personifications of the powers and operations to the lowest forms of fetichism. Largely, however, their theistic thought includes the notion of personality, and so a point of fellowship is established between the worshiper and his gods. But we have to do mainly with the monotheistic faiths or periods of faith. In the early belief of Egypt, of China, of India, in the teaching of Zoroaster, of Celtic Druidism, of Assyrian and Babylonian faith, and in the best intuition of the Greek and Roman philosophers, without doubt, God was apprehended as a personal God. Indeed, in almost the whole world's religious thinking this element of true theistic conception has had more or less positive recognition and maintenance. It seems to have been spontaneously and necessarily demanded by the religious sense and life.

Human Feeling of Helplessness.

The human feeling of helplessness and need called for a God who could hear and understand, feel and act. And whenever thought rose beyond the many pseudo-gods to the existence of the one true God, as a Creator and Ruler of the world, the ten thousand marks of order, plan and purpose in nature speaking to men's hearts and reason led up to the grand truth that the Maker of all is a Thinker, and both knows and wills. And so a relation of trust, fellowship and intercourse was found and recognized. None of the real feelings of worship, love, devotion, gratitude, consecration, could live and act simply in the presence of an impersonal, unconscious, fateful energy or order of nature. No consistent hope of a conscious personal future life can be established except as it is rooted in faith in a personal God.

And yet the personality of God has often been much obscured in the historic faiths. The observation has not come as a natural and spontaneous product of the religious impulse or consciousness, but of mystic speculative philosophies. The phenomenon presented by Spinozism and later pantheisms, in the presence of Christianity, was substantially anticipated again and again, ages ago, in the midst of various religious faiths, despite their own truer visions of the eternal God. As we understand it, the philosophy of religion with Hinduism, the later Confucianism, developed Parseism and Druidism is substantially pantheistic, reducing God to impersonal existence or the conscious factors and forces of cosmic order. It marks some of these more strongly and injuriously than others.

How far do the religions harmonize in including creational relation and activity in their conception of God? In Christianity, as you know, the notion of creatorship is inseparable from the divine idea. "In the beginning God created." Creator is another name for Him. How is it in the polytheistic mythologies? The conception is thrown into inextricable confusion. In some, as in the early Greek and Roman, the heavens and the earth are eternal, and the gods, even the highest, are their offspring. In advancing stages and fuller pantheons,

almost everywhere, the notion of creatorship emerges in connection with the mythologic divinities. In the monotheisms, whether the earlier or those reached in philosophic periods, it is clear and unequivocal—in China, India, Egypt, Persia and the Druidic teaching.

Creational
Relation.

Pantheistic thought, however, while it offers accounts of world origins, confuses or overthrows real creational action by various processes of divine and self-unfolding, in which God and the universe are identified and either the divine is lost in the natural, or nature itself is God. The pantheism seems to resolve itself sometimes into atheism; sometimes into acosmism. But while the creative attribute seems to appear in some way and measure in all the historic religions, I have found no instance apart from Christianity and its derivatives in which *creatio ex nihilo*, or absolute creation, is taught. This is a distinction in which Christianity must be counted as fairly standing alone.

A point of high importance respects the inclusion of the ethical attribute in the notion of God and the divine government. To what extent do they hold Him, not only a governor, but a moral governor, whose will enthrones righteousness and whose administration aims at moral character and the blessedness of ethical order and excellence? The comparison on this point reveals some strange phenomena. In the nature-worships and polytheistic conditions there is found an almost complete disconnection between religion and morality, the rituals of worship not being at all adjusted to the idea that the gods were holy, sin-hating, pure and righteous. The grossest anthropomorphisms have prevailed, and almost every passion, vice, meanness and wrong found among men were paralleled in the nature and actions of the gods. Often their very worship has been marked by horrible and degrading rites. But as human nature carries in itself a moral constitution and the reason spontaneously acts in the way of moral distinctions, judgments and demands, it necessarily, as it advanced in knowledge, credited the objects of its worship with more or less of the moral qualities it required in men. The moral institutions and demands could not act with clearness and force in rude and uncivilized men and peoples. The degrees of ethical elements in their conception of the gods reflected the less or greater development of the moral life that evolved the theistic ideas.

But whenever the religious faith was monotheistic, and especially in its more positive and clearer forms, the logic of reason and conscience lifted thought into clear and unequivocal apprehension of the Supreme Being as the power whose government makes for righteousness. Finely and impressively does this attribute come to view in the teachings of the faith of the ancient Egyptians, of Confucianism, of Zoroastrianism, of Druidism, and of the theism of the Greek and Roman sages. But Brahmanism, that mighty power of the east, though it abounds in moral precepts and virtuous maxims and rules of life, fails to give these a truly religious or theistic sanction by any clear assurance that the advancement or triumph of the right and good is the aim of the divine government. Indeed, the pantheistic thought of

that system obliterating the divine personality leaves scarcely any room for a moral purpose, or any other purpose, in the cosmic energy. And Buddhism, though largely a philosophical ethic only—however, of the “good” sort—yet by its failure to make positive assertion of a Supreme Being, save simply as the infinite unknown behind nature, of which (Brahma) nothing may be predicted except that it is, perceives and is blessed, fails also, of course, to affirm any moral predicates for its nature or movement. The ethics of life, divorced from religious sanction, stand apart from theistic dynamics.

Moral Attrib-
utes of God.

Christianity makes the moral attributes of God fundamental. His government and providence have a supreme ethical aim, the overthrow of sin with its disorder and misery, and the making of all things new in a kingdom in which righteousness shall dwell. And we rejoice to trace from the great natural religions round the globe how generally, and sometimes inspiringly, this grand feature of true theism has been discerned and used for the uplifting of character and life, furnishing a testimony obscured or broken only by the crudest fetichisms, or lowest polytheisms, or by pantheistic teachings that reduce God to impersonality where the concept of moral character becomes inapplicable.

But a single additional feature of theistic teaching can be brought into this comparative view. How far do the various religions include in their idea of God redemptive relation and administration? Some comparativists, as you are aware, class two of them as religions of redemption or deliverance—Buddhism and Christianity. But if Buddhism is to be so classed, there is no reason for not including Brahmanism. For, as Prof. Max Müller has so clearly shown, Buddhism rests upon and carries forward the same fundamental conceptions of the world and human destiny and the way of its attainment. They both start with the fact that the condition of man is unhappy through his own errors, and set forth a way of deliverance or salvation. Both connect this state of misery with the fundamental doctrine of metempsychosis, innumerable repeated incarnations, or births and deaths, with a possible deliverance in a final absorption into the repose of absolute existence or cessation of conscious individuality—Nirvana.

It is connected, too, in both, with a philosophy of the world that pantheistically reduces God into impersonality, making the divine but the ever-moving course of nature.. And the deliverance comes as no free gift, gracious help or accomplishment of God, but an issue that a man wins for himself by knowledge, ascetic repression of desire and self-reduction out of conscious individuality, re-absorption into primal being. God is not conceived of as a being of redeeming love and loving activity. A philosophy of self-redemption is substituted for faith and surrender to a redeeming god. As I understand it, it is a philosophy that pessimistically condemns life itself as an evil and misfortune to be escaped from and to be escaped by self-redemption, because life finds no saving in God. And so these faiths cannot fairly be said to attribute to God redemptive character and administration.

Christianity stands, therefore, as the only faith that truly and

fully conceives of God in redemptory rulership and activity. In this faith "God is love," in deepest and most active sympathy with man. While He rules for the maintenance and victory of righteousness, He uses, also, redeeming action for the same high ends—recovering the lost to holiness. In this comes in the unique supernatural character of Christianity. It is not a mere evolution of natural religious intuitions. Even as a revelation, it is not simply an ethic or a philosophy of happy life. Christianity stands fundamentally and essentially for a course of divine redemptive action, the incoming presence and activity of the supernatural in the world and time.

Supernatural
Character of
Christianity.

Let us fix this clearly in mind, as its distinction among all religions, causing it to stand apart and alone. From the beginning of the Old Testament to the end of the New it is a disclosure in record of what God in grace has done, is doing, and will do, for the deliverance, recovery and eternal salvation from sin of lapsed, sin-enslaved humanity. It is a supernatural redemptory work and provision with an inspired instruction as to the way and duty of life. If Christianity be not this, Christendom has been deluded. It is the religion of the divine love and help which the race needs and only God could give.

Let us sum up the results of this hurried comparison. On the fundamental point of affirming or implying the existence of God the testimony is a rich harmony. To the monotheistic conception there is strong witness from the chief earliest great historical religions—the Egyptian, Chinese, Indian, original Zoroastrianism and Druidism, obscured and almost lost in later growths of enormous polytheisms, till restored there and elsewhere in greater or less degree under the better intuitions of sages, including those of Greece and Rome. The divine personality is witnessed to, though often under the rudest and most distorted notions, by almost all religions, but darkened out of sight by pantheistic developments in India, China, Druidism and among the Greeks. Creational activity in some sense and measure has been almost everywhere included in the idea of God; but *creatio ex nihilo* seems peculiar to Christianity. The attribution of ethical attributes to God has varied in degrees according to the civilization and culture of the tribes and nations or their religious leaders made inconsistent here and there by pantheistic theories—Christianity, however, giving the moral idea supreme emphasis. And finally, redeeming love and effort in redemption from moral evil is clearly asserted only in the Christian teaching.

A Rich Har-
mony.

The other historic faiths have grasped some of the great essential elements of theistic truth. We rejoice to trace and recognize them. But they all shine forth in Christian revelation. As I see it, the other historic beliefs have no elements of true theistic conception to give to Christianity that it has not, but Christianity has much to give to the others. It unites and consummates out of its own given light all the theistic truth that has been sought and seen in partial vision by sincere souls along the ages and round the world. And more, it gives what they have not—a disclosure of God's redeeming love and action, presenting to mankind the way, the truth and the life. And we joy to hold it and offer it as the hope of the world.



Rabbi E. G. Hirsch, Chicago.

Elements of Universal Religion.

Paper by DR. EMIL G. HIRSCH, of Chicago.



HE dominion of religion is co-extensive with the confines of humanity. For man is by nature not only, as Aristotle puts the case, the political—he is as clearly the religious creature. Religion is one of the natural functions of the human soul; it is one of the natural conditions of human, as distinct from mere animal life. To this proposition ethnology and sociology bear abundant testimony. Man alone in the wide sweep of creation builds altars. And wherever man may tent there also will curve upward the burning incense of his sacrifice or the sweeter savor of his aspirations after the better, the diviner light. However rude the form of society in which he moves, or however refined and complex the social organism, religion never fails to be among the determining forces one of the most potent. It, under all types of social architecture, will be active as one of the decisive influences rounding out individual life and lifting it into significance for and under the swifter and stronger current of the social relations. Climatic and historical accidents may modify, and do, the action of this all-pervading energy. But under every sky it is vital and under all temporary conjunctures it is quick.

Vital under
every sky.

A man without religion is not normal. There may be those in whom this function approaches atrophy. But they are undeveloped or crippled specimens of the completer type. Their condition recalls that of the color blind or the deaf. Can they contend that their defect is proof of superiority? As well might those bereft of the sense of hearing insist that because to them the reception of sound is denied the universe around them is a vast ocean of unbroken silence. A society without religion has nowhere yet been discovered. Religion may then in very truth be said to be the universal distinction of man.

Still the universal religion has as yet not been evolved in the procession of the suns. It is one of the blessings yet to come. There are now even known to men and revered by them great religious systems



which pretend to universality. And who would deny that Buddhism, Christianity and the faith of Islam present many of the characteristic elements of the universal faith? In its ideas and ideals the religion of the prophets, notably as enlarged by those of the Babylonian exile, also deserves to be numbered among the proclamations of a wider outlook and a higher uplook. These systems are no longer ethnic. They thus, the three in full practice and the last mentioned in spiritual intention, have passed beyond some of the most notable limitations which are fundamental in other forms created by the religious needs of man. They have advanced far on the road leading to the ideal goal; and modern man, in his quest for the elements of the still broader universal faith, will never again retrace his steps to go back to the mile-posts these have left behind on their climb up the heights. The three great religions have emancipated themselves from the bondage of racial tests and national divisions. Race and nationality cannot circumscribe the fellowship of the larger communion of the faithful, a communion destined to embrace in one covenant all the children of man.

Race Acci-
dental.

Race is accidental, not essential in manhood. Color is indeed only skin deep. No caste or tribe, even were we to concede the absolute purity of the blood flowing in their arteries, an assumption which could in no case be verified by actual facts of the case, can lay claim to superior sanctity. None is nearer the heart of God than another. He certainly who takes his survey of humanity from the outlook of religion and from this point of view remembers the serious possibilities and the sacred obligations of human life cannot adopt the theory that spirit is the exponent of animal nature. Yet such would be the conclusion if the doctrine of chosen races and tribes is at all to be urged. The racial element is merely the animal substratum of our being. Brain and blood may be crutches which the mind must use. But mind is always more than the brain with which it works, and the soul's equation cannot be solved in terms of the blood corpuscles or the pigment of the skin or the shape of the nose or the curl of the hair.

Ezra with his insistence that citizenship in God's people is dependent on Abrahamitic pedigree, and therefore on the superior sanctity which by very birth the seed of the patriarch enjoys as Zea Kodesh, does not voice the broader and truer views of those that would prophesy of the universal faith. Indeed, the apostles of Christianity after Paul, the Pundits of Buddhism, the Imams of Islam and last, though not least, the rabbis of modern Judaism, have abandoned the narrow prejudice of the scribe. God is no respecter of persons. In His sight it is the black heart and not the black skin, the crooked deed and not the curved nose which excludes. National affinities and memories, however potent for good and though more spiritual than racial bonds, are still too narrow to serve as foundation stones for the temple of all humanity.

The day of national religions is past. The God of the universe

speaks to all mankind. He is not the God of Israel alone, not that of Moab, of Egypt, Greece or America. He is not domiciled in Palestine. The Jordan and the Ganges, the Tiber and the Euphrates hold water wherewith the devout may be baptized unto His service and redemption. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Whither flee from thy presence?" exclaims the old Hebrew bard. And before his wondering gaze unrolled itself the awful certainty that the heavenly divisions of morning and night were obliterated in the all-embracing sweep of divine law and love. If the wide expanses of the skies and the abysses of the deep cannot shut out from the divine presence, can the pigmy barriers erected by man and preserved by political intrigues and national pride dam in the mighty stream of divine love? The prophet of Islam repeats the old Hebrew singer's joy when he says: "The East is God's and the West is His," as indeed the apostle true to the spirit of the prophetic message of Messianic Judaism refused to tolerate the line of cleavage marked by language or national affinity. Greek and Jew are invited by him to the citizenship of kingdom come.

The church universal must have the pentecostal gift of the many flaming tongues in it, as the rabbis say was the case at Sinai. God's revelation must be sounded in every language to every land. But, and this is essential as marking a new advance, the universal religion for all the children of Adam will not palisade its courts by the pointed and forbidding stakes of a creed. Creeds in time to come will be recognized to be indeed cruel barbed wire fences, wounding those that would stray to broader pastures and hurting others who would come in. Will it for this be a Godless church? Ah, no! it will have much more of God than the churches and synagogues with their dogmatic definitions now possess. Coming man will not be ready to resign the crown of his glory which is his by virtue of his feeling himself to be the son of God. He will not exchange the church's creed for that still more presumptuous and deadening one of materialism which would ask his acceptance of the hopeless perversion that the world which sweeps by us in such sublime harmony and order is not cosmos but chaos—is the fortuitous outcome of the chance play of atoms producing consciousness by the interaction of their own unconsciousness. Man will not extinguish the light of his own higher life by shutting his eyes to the telling indications of purpose in history, a purpose which when revealed to him in the outcome of his own career, he may well find reflected also in the interrelated life of nature. But for all this man will learn a new modesty now woefully lacking to so many who honestly deem themselves religious. His God will not be a figment, cold and distant, of metaphysics, nor a distorted caricature of embittered theology. "Can man by searching find out God?" asks the old Hebrew poet. And the ages so flooded with religious strife are vocal with the stinging rebuke to all creed-builders that man cannot. Man grows unto the knowledge of God, but not to him is vouchsafed that fullness of knowledge which would warrant his arrogance to hold that his blurred vision is the full light and that there can be none other might which report truth as does his.

The Church
Universal.

A Prophetic
Caution.

Says Maimonides, greatest thinker of the many Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages: "Of God we may merely assert that He is; what He is in Himself we cannot know. 'My thoughts are not your thoughts and My ways are not your ways.'" This prophetic caution will resound in clear notes in the ears of all who will worship in the days to come at the universal shrine. They will cease their futile efforts to give a definition of Him who cannot be defined in human symbols. They will certainly be astonished at our persistence—in their eyes very blasphemy—to describe by article of faith God, as though He were a fugitive from justice and a Pinkerton detective should be enabled to capture Him by the identification laid down in the catalogue of His attributes. The religion universal will not presume to regulate God's government of this world by circumscribing the sphere of His possible salvation, and declaring as though He had taken us into His counsel whom He must save and whom He may not save. The universal religion will once more make the God idea a vital principle of human life. It will teach men to find Him in their own heart and to have Him with them in whatever they may do. No mortal has seen God's face, but he who opens his heart to the message will, like Moses on the lonely rock, behold Him pass and hear the solemn proclamation.

It is not in the storm of fanaticism nor in the fire of prejudice, but in the still small voice of conscience that God speaks and is to be found. He believes in God who lives a Godlike, *i. e.*, a goodly life. Not he who mumbles his credo, but he who lives it, is accepted. Were those marked for glory by the great teacher of Nazareth who wore the largest phylacteries? Is the Sermon on the Mount a creed? Was the Decalogue a creed? Character and conduct, not creed, will be the keynote of the Gospel in the Church of Humanity Universal.

But what then about sin? Sin as a theological imputation will perhaps drop out of the vocabulary of this larger communion of the righteous. But as a weakness to be overcome, an imperfection to be laid aside, man will be as potently reminded of his natural shortcomings as he is now of that of his first progenitor over whose conduct he certainly had no control and for whose misdeed he should not be held accountable. Religion will then as now lift man above his weaknesses by reminding him of his responsibilities. The goal before is paradise. Eden is to come. It has not yet been. And the life of the great and good and saintly, who went about doing good in their generations, and who died that others might live, will for very truth be pointed out as the spring from which have flown the waters of salvation by whose magic efficacy all men may be washed clean, if baptized in the spirit which was living within these God-appointed redeemers of their infirmities.

This religion will indeed be for man to lead him to God. Its sacramental word will be duty. Labor is not the curse but the blessing of human life. For as man was made in the image of the Creator, it is his to create. Earth was given him for his habitation. He changed it from chaos into his home. A theology and a Monotheism,

which will not leave room in this world for man's free activity and dooms him to passive inactivity, will not harmonize with the truer recognition that man and God are the co-relates of a working plan of life. Sympathy and resignation are indeed beautiful flowers grown in the garden of many a tender and noble human heart. But it is active love and energy which alone can push on the chariot of human progress, and progress is the gradual realization of the divine spirit which is incarnate in every human being. This principle will assign to religion once more the place of honor among the redeeming agencies of society from the bondage of selfishness. On this basis every man is every other man's brother, not merely in misery, but in active work. "As you have done to the least of these you have unto Me," will be the guiding principle of human conduct in all the relations into which human life enters. No longer shall we hear Cam's enormous excuse, a scathing accusation of himself, "Am I my brother's keeper?" no longer will be tolerated or condoned the double standard of morality, one for Sunday and the church and another diametrically opposed for weekdays and the counting-room. Not as now will be heard the cynic insistence that "business is business" and has as business no connection with the Decalogue or the Sermon on the Mount. Religion will, as it did in Jesus, penetrate into all the relations of human society. Not then will men be rated as so many hands to be bought at the lowest possible price, in accordance with a deified law of supply and demand, which cannot stop to consider such sentimentalities, as the fact that these hands stand for soul and hearts.

An invidious distinction obtains now between secular and sacred. It will be wiped away. Every thought and every deed of man must be holy or it is unworthy of men. Did Jesus merely regard the temple as holy? Did Buddha merely have religion on one or two hours of the Sabbath? Did not an earlier prophet deride and condemn all ritual religion? "Wash ye, make ye clean." Was this not the burden of Isarah's religion? The religion universal will be true to these, its forerunners.

But what about death and hereafter? This religion will not dim the hope which has been man's since the first day of his stay on earth. But it will be most emphatic in winning men to the conviction that a life worthily spent here on earth is the best, is the only preparation for heaven. Said the old rabbis: "One hour spent here in truly good works and in the true intimacy with God is more precious than all life to be." The egotism which now mars so often the aspirations of our souls, the scramble for glory which comes while we forget duty, will be replaced by a serene trust in the eternal justice of Him "in Whom we live and move and have our being." To have done religiously will be a reward sweeter than which none can be offered. Yea, the religion of the future will be impatient of men who claim that they have the right to be saved, while they are perfectly content that others shall not be saved, and while not stirring a foot or lifting a hand to redeem brother men from hunger and wretchedness, in the cool assur-

Death and
Hereafter

ance that this life is destined or doomed to be a free race of haggling, snarling competitors in which, by some mysterious will of providence, the devil takes the hindmost.

Will there be prayer in the universal religion? Man will worship, but in the beauty of holiness his prayer will be the prelude to his prayerful action. Silence is more reverential and worshipful than a wild torrent of words breathing forth not adoration, but greedy requests for favors to self. Can an unforgiving heart pray "forgive as we forgive?" Can one ask for daily bread when he refuses to break his bread with the hungry? Did not the prayer of the Great Master of Nazareth thus teach all men and all ages that prayer must be the stirring to love?

Had not that little waif caught the inspiration of our universal prayer who, when first taught its sublime phrases, persisted in changing the opening words to "Your Father which is in heaven?" Rebuked time and again by the teacher, he finally broke out, "Well, if it is our Father, why, I am your brother." Yea, the gates of prayer in the church to rise will lead to the recognition of the universal brotherhood of men.

Will this new faith have its Bible? It will. It retains the old Bibles of mankind, but gives them a new luster by remembering that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Religion is not a question of literature, but of life. God's revelation is continuous, not contained in tablets of stone or sacred parchment. He speaks today yet to those that would hear Him. A book is inspired when it inspires. Religion made the Bible, not the book religion.

A Question
of Life.

And what will be the name of this church? It will be known not by its founders, but by its fruits. God replies to him who insists upon knowing His name: "I am He who I am." The church will be. If any name it will have, it will be "the church of God," because it will be the church of man.

When Jacob, so runs an old rabbinical legend, weary and footsore the first night of his sojourn away from home, would lay him down to sleep under the canopy of the starset skies, all the stones of the field exclaimed: "Take me for thy pillow." And because all were ready to serve him all were miraculously turned into one stone. This became Beth El, the gate of heaven. So will all religions, because eager to become the pillow of man, dreaming of God and beholding the ladder joining earth to heaven, be transformed into one great rock which the ages cannot move, a foundation stone for the all-embracing temple of humanity united to do God's will with one accord.



Interior of the Church of Ecce Homo, Jerusalem.

The Essential Oneness of Ethical Ideas Among All Men.

Paper by REV. IDA C. HULTIN.



F ethical ideas, not of ethical systems or doctrines, am I bidden to speak today. Let me say ethical sense. It will mean the same and be more simple. The universality of the ethical sense. Gravitation is not more surely a fact, it seems to us, than is the unity of all life. If life is a whole, then that which is an essential quality of one part must be common to the whole. Through all life not only an eternal purpose runs, but an eternal moral purpose. Human history has been a struggle of man to understand himself and the other selves, and beyond that the infinite self.

The laws which, with unswerving fidelity, the stars obey in their eternal sweep through space, that the dewdrop responds to when it becomes an ocean to mirror back the world, that chisels the lichen's circle and paints the sunset, that draws the lily from the black ooze of the pond and calls the atoms to their foreordained places in the crystal—this law is ineradicably written in the nature of man and issues as ethical sense. Of course, we understand that with some the experiences of animal and human life in the long eons of their existence is the explanation of the existence of this sense. Add to the experience of individuals the hereditary tendency which accumulates and passes on in increasing power from generation to generation, the results of all struggle, and you have an all-sufficient answer about the whence of this ethical sense. We do not deny the truth of the cumulative tendency of experience, but we do deny that it solves all the problem. Would this not be evolution, doing that which it claims cannot be done, creating something out of nothing? If the fittest, morally as well as physically, is to survive, then there must have been something that had the ele-

The Whence
of Ethical
Sense.

ment of fitness to start with. In the fire-mist and world-stuff of our solar system's beginning there were the elements, or element, from which, through change and growth, has come the multiplicity of the life of our world. What is the meaning of all this varied life? It is not real. It is not stable. To what is it passing? From whence does it come? Is there no infinite fact to match the finite fact, or the human mind and soul? Is there no invisible real to which the visible passing stands related?

The old oak tree, we say, is what it is because it has grown through years and storms, through heat and cold, withstanding and outliving them all. What made it to be an oak tree? It will not always be so, and what will the life of it be when it is not oak tree? Did sun and rain and storm and seasons create the oak? Then plant a piece from your polished oak table, give it to the earth and the sun and rain and storms and ask them to make it grow. Will it? What is in the acorn that answers back to the call of the voices of the earth and air, and draws from the invisible places of the universe the atoms that come trooping to take their places in root and trunk and limb and leaf and blossom and fruit? Is it not God in the acorn? And could it grow without its God? I ask this question reverentially, and when I say God, friends, I mean the same invisible spirit that you mean when you pronounce another name. We each know that the other is but naming his or her best conception of the Infinite, and if we should put all of these words together, we would not have the whole name, for the secret of its pronunciation lieth with Him, whose children we all are. This all-pervading principle—this sense of right, of good that we find to be the possession of all peoples, of life, is it not God in us? You may call it a categorical imperative, a primitive element in the soul, a sense rooted in the nature of things, the moral sense of the universe, what you will, it is the sign and seal of our heredity from God. Mine, yours, ours, humanity's. Humanity is not God-touched in spots, with primitive exterior revelations on mountain tops for a chosen few. He is the Divine Immanence, the source of all—revealing Himself to all; recognized just so fast as His children grow able to discover Him. It is an infinite revelation—an eternal discovery. Hunger is the goad to growth; hunger for protoplasm, and then—Oh, the weary way that stretches between!—hunger for righteousness. An eternal search—an eternal finding. The resistless sweep of the divine forces bears man on to newer and ever newer births.

God In Us.

We find that we cannot speak of ethical principles without touching religious realities. Let us identify morals with religion. Is it not time? I do not mean by religion theological formulas, creeds, doctrines. I do not mean a religion. I mean religion. The science of man's highest development, physical, mental, moral development. There is no part of life that may not, ought not to be religious. You cannot make one part of your nature religious, as though it were a side issue of real living. In the last analysis it becomes correlated with the nature of things, with God. Not simply dependence on, as

though there was a full sway from Him, but consciousness of unity, and as if we craved the unity as if He needed us and we were hastening to do His will and ours. The doing of the will is ethical action. It is man at work on the problem, the making of religious conditions. It is humanity on the road toward God.

Our Higher
Heritage.

How rarely do we enter into the full possibilities of our high heritage. They who have learned to live on the heights have been the prophet souls of all ages and all races. The multitudinous voice of humanity has uttered itself through them. I know that there are sore souls, but if we would know humanity we must interpret it at its best. What these are, all humanity may be. The ideal man is the actual man. It is what all men may become. The ought that moves one man to deeds that thrill a nation is essentially the same in kind with the ought that impels the lowliest deed in the obscurest corner of the world. If one human soul has come into being without a tendency toward goodness, toward the right, the true, and with hope to at length reach a divine destiny, then the universe is a failure. There is a place where God is not, and infinite goodness, infinite justice, is a myth. Morality may not be possible in ant and bee and beaver and dog, but ethical principle is there. Striving to be man, the worm struggles through all the spheres of form. Not that man is recognized and there is a conscious reach toward him, but because back of worm and clod there is the same persuasive power that impelled man to be man, that led him to lay hold of the forces of the universe and compel them to serve him. Through the realization of the divine potency of the ethical sense in the experiences of his own life, man becomes conscious of God, of God as good. Rising to this higher realization through the lesser, the lesser takes on new meaning. Our relations to tree, to dog, to man, assume new dignity. We find the ultimate meaning of these common relationships. Here is the explanation of life's details. They are all manifestations of God. He is Lord of these hosts, He is all. And we find Him only as we tread loyally the pathway of the common place. Relationship to Him is the culmination of all these lesser relationships. And

Explanation
of Life's De-
tails.

"We turn from seeking Thee afar
And in unwonted ways,
To build from out our daily lives
The temples of Thy praise."

Humanity does not reach its best life through any scheme of redemption, but through an age-long struggle with God. It is not "What shall I do to be saved?" but "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" The moral man is obeying the God-voice, whether he knows to call it that or not. Is he denied theological classification? Well, it will not be surprising if he enters heaven without a label. He who cannot hear God, see God, feel God in the living, potent things of the every day must buy a book and find God and His law there. But if the church disband or his book is burned, where shall he turn for authority? May he steal now with impunity? Pity the man whose moral nature is not

a law unto himself. Shrink from it though we may, the truth appears, when we are honest with ourselves, that churches and creeds have never done the world's best work. The church has never freed the slave of any land. In this country, even while the armies were gathering, which eventually freed the slave, ministers were preaching that slavery was divinely ordained and right according to the word of God. But the spirit of eternal justice, revealing itself in the ethical sense of thousands of men and women, ignoring the dogma and its expounders, moved against the wrong and overcame it. There were those who could read but one page of God's Word, but in the "terrible swift lightning" of that judgment day men read the law written by human hearts.

Spirit of
Eternal Justice

Try to evade the truth if you will; you must face it at last. No creedal church and no form of ecclesiasticism has ever lent itself to the emancipation of the woman half of humanity. She has suffered and still suffers because of the results of dogmatic beliefs and theological traditions, but the ethical sense of the humanity of which she is a part is lifting her out into the fullness of religious liberty. She does not come into the fellowship to write creeds nor to impose dogmas, but to co-operate in such high living as shall make possible religiousness. She comes to help do away with false standards of conduct by demanding morality for morality, purity for purity, self-respecting manhood for self-respecting womanhood. She will help remove odious distinctions on account of sex and make one code of morals do for both men and women. This not alone in the western world, where circumstances have been more propitious for woman's advancement, but in all parts of the world.


Churches as a whole do not feed the hungry, clothe the sick, turn prisons into reformatories and unite to stay the atrocities of legalized cruelties. If churches were doing the humane work of the world there would not be needed so many clubs and associations and institutions for philanthropic work. Men and women in the churches and out of them do this work. While theologians are busy with each other and the creeds, these men and women, belonging to all countries and all races, who perhaps have not had time to formulate their beliefs about humanity, are busy working for it. Those who have never known how to define God are finding Him in their daily lives. Faith? Yes, but faith without works is dead. When the ethical intent has been removed from a theological system it is a dead faith.

Faith With-
out Works is
Dead.

Interesting is the history of a religious convention, and not to be lightly estimated; but as a working force in spiritual advancement it is useless. It was well said from this platform a few days ago, not Christianity, but Christ, I plead. Many of us are not particular about the Christian name, but we do care about the Christ spirit; that same spirit that has been the animating force in every prophet life. The religious aspirations that gave birth to the ethical science, that made to be alive old forms, have passed on to vivify new forms and systems that yet shall have a day and give place to others. "It is the spirit that gives it life; the letter kills it."

Rich with
Blessings.

When you remember some of the things that have been taught and have been done in the name of Christ, do you wonder that our brother said, "If such be the Christian ethics, well, we are perfectly satisfied to be heathen?" Do you wonder that the calm-souled prophet from India pleads with us for a manifestation of the spirit that was in Jesus? Do we need assurance that boasting of our religion will not prove us to be a religious people? This pentecostal session is rich with blessing if we are able to bear it. May it help us to help each other, to understand each other, to believe in each other; and out of the fellowship of this time may there grow a diviner love for all that is human, a deeper reverence and braver faith in its possibility, a surer knowledge of this essential oneness. Learning to love each other, may we abide in the measureless, matchless love which, because we know no better naming, we call our Father, Mother, God.



Concessions to Native Religious Ideas, Having Special Reference to Hinduism.

Paper by REV. L. E. SLATER, of Bungalow, India.



THE Hindus by instinct and tradition are the most religious people in the world. They are born religiously, they eat, bathe, shave and write religiously, they die and are cremated or buried religiously, and for years afterward are devoutly remembered religiously. They will not take a house or open a shop or office, they will not go on a journey or engage in any enterprise without some religious observance. We thus appeal in our missionary effort to a deeply religious nature; we sow the gospel seed in a religious soil.

The religion of a nation is its sacred impulse toward an ideal, however imperfectly apprehended and realized it may be. The spirit of India's religions has been a reflective spirit, hence its philosophical character, and to understand and appreciate them, we must look beyond the barbaric shows and feasts and ceremonies, and get to the undercurrents of native thought. Hinduism is a growth from within; and to study it we have to lay bare that inward, subtle soul which, strangely enough, explains the outward form with all its extravagances; for India's gross idolatry is connected with her ancient systems of speculative philosophy; and with an extensive literature in the Sanskrit language; her Epic, Puranic and Tantrika mythologies and cosmogonies have a theosophic basis.

India, whose worship was the probable cradle of all other similar worships, is the richest mine of religious ideas; yet we cannot speak of the religion of India. What is styled "Hinduism" is a vague eclecticism, the sum total of several shades of belief, of divergent systems, of various types and characters of the outward life, each of which at one time or another calls itself Hinduism, but which, apparently, bears little resemblance to the other beliefs. Every phase of religious

Hinduism
Not One
Religion.

thought and philosophic speculation has been represented in India. Some of the Hindu doctrines are theistic, some atheistic and materialistic, others pantheistic—the extreme development of idealism. Some of the sects hold that salvation is obtained by practicing austerities and by self-devotion and prayer; some that faith and love (bhakti) form the ruling principle; others that sacrificial observances are the only means. Some teach the doctrine of predestination; others that of free grace.

Habits of
Thought and
Life.

It is hard for foreigners to understand the habits of thought and life that prevail in a strange country, as well as all the changes and sacrifices that conversion entails; and, with our brusque, matter-of-fact western instincts and our lack of spiritual and philosophic insight, we too often go forth denouncing the traditions and worship of the people, and, in so doing, are apt, with our heavy heels, to trample on beliefs and sentiments that have a deep and sacred root. A knowledge of the material on which we work is quite as important as deftness in handling our tools; a knowledge of the soil as necessary as the conviction that the seed is good.

Let us glance now, in the briefest manner, at some of the fundamental ideas and aspects of Brahmanical Hinduism, that may be regarded as a preparation for the Gospel, and links by which a Christian advocate may connect the religion of the incarnation and the cross with the higher phases of religious thought and life in India. It should be borne in mind, however, throughout, that this foreshadowing relation between Hinduism and Christianity is ancient rather than modern, that these "foreshadowings" of the Gospel are unsuspected by the masses of the people; and, further, that the points of similarity between the two faiths are sometimes apparent rather than real, and that the whole inquiry becomes clear only as we realize that Hinduism has been a keen and pathetic search after a salvation to be wrought by man rather than a restful satisfaction in a redemption designed and offered by God.

The underlying element of all religions, without which there can be no spiritual worship, is the belief that the human worshiper is somehow made in the likeness of the divine. And the central thought of India, which binds together all its conflicting elements, is the revelation of life, the progress of the pilgrim soul through all definite existences to reunion with the infinite. From the opening youthfulness, hopefulness and self-sufficiency depicted in the songs of the Rig-veda, where the spirit is bright and joyous and homage is given to the forms and powers of nature—the mirror of man's own life and freedom—on through the dreary stage, where "the weary weight of this unintelligible world" and the soul wakes from the illusive dream of childhood to experience a bitter disappointment, to realize that the search for individual happiness in the infinite or phenomenal is a futile one, to find that the world is a vain shadow, an empty show, the reverence of the Indian has not been for the material form, but for pure spirit—for his own conscious soul—whose essential unity with the divine is an

axiomatic truth, and whose power to abide in the midst of all changes is the test of its everlasting being, the proof of its immortality.

The ideal, then, before which the Indian Gnostic bows, is the spirit of man. The soul retires within itself, in a state of ecstatic reverie, the highest form of which is called Yoga, and meditates on the secret of its own nature; and having made the discovery, which comes sooner or later to all, that the world, instead of being an elysium, is an illusion, a vexation of spirit, the speculative problem of Indian philosophy and the actual struggle of the religious man have been how to break the dream, get rid of the impostures of sense and time, emancipate the self from the bondage of the fleeting world and attain the one reality—the invisible, the divine. This can only be achieved by becoming detached from material things, by ceasing to love the world, by the mortification of desire. And though this "love of the world" may have little in common with the idea of the Apostle John, yet have we not here an affinity with the affirmation of Christianity, that "the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor., iv., 18); that "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof" (1 John, ii., 17); though the Christian completion of that verse, "but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever," marks the fundamental defect of pantheistic India and its striking contrast to the Gospel.

Ideal of the
Indian Gnos-
tics.

For the God of Hinduism is a pure Intelligence, a Thinker; not a Sovereign Will as in Islam, nor the Lord of Light and Right as in Parsiism, still less having any paternal or providential character. Nothing is created by His power, but all is evolved by emanation, from the one eternal Entity, like sparks from fire. No commands come from such a Being, but all things flow from Him, as light from the sun, or thoughts from a musing man. Hence, while between God and the worshiper there is the most direct affinity, which may become identity, there exists no bond of sympathy, no active and intelligent co-operation, and no quickening power being exercised on the human will, and in the formation of character, the fatal and fatalistic weakness of Hindu life appears, which renders the Gospel appeal so often powerless; the lost sense of practical moral distinction, of the requirements of conscience, of any necessary connection between thought and action, convictions and conduct, of divine authority over the soul, of personal responsibility, of the duty of the soul to love and honor God, and to love one's neighbor as one's self.

God of the
Hindus a
Thinker.

Idolatry itself, foolish and degrading as it is, seeks to realize to the senses what otherwise is only an idea; it witnesses, as all great errors do, to a great truth; and it is only by distinctly recognizing and liberating the truth that underlies the error, and of which the error is the counterpart, that the error can be successfully combated and slain. Every error will live as long, and only as long, as its share of truth remains unrecognized. Adapting words that Archdeacon Hare wrote of Dr. Arnold: "We must be iconoclasts, at once zealous and fearless in demolishing the reigning idols, and at the same time animated

Idolatry Wit-
ness to a Truth.

with a reverent love for the ideas that the idols carnalize and stifle." Idolatry is a strong human protest against pantheism, which denies the personality of God, and atheism, which denies God altogether; it testifies to the natural craving of the heart to have before it some manifestation of the Unseen—to behold a humanized god. It is not, at bottom, an effort to get away from God, but to bring God near.

Once more. The idea of the need of sacrificial acts, "the first and primary rites"—eucharistic, sacramental and propitiatory—bearing the closest parallelism to the provisions of the Mosaic economy and prompted by a sense of personal unworthiness, guilt and misery—that life is to be forfeited to the Divine Proprietor—is ingrained in the whole system of Vedic Hinduism. A sense of original corruption has been felt by all classes of Hindus, as indicated in the prayer:

"I am sinful; I commit sin; my nature is sinful. Save me, O thou lotus-eyed Hari, the remover of sin.

The first man, after the deluge, whom the Hindus called Manu and the Hebrews Noah, offered a burnt offering. No literature, not even the Jewish, contains so many words relating to sacrifice as Sanskrit. The land has been saturated with blood."

The secret of this great importance attached to sacrifice is to be found in the remarkable fact that the authorship of the institution is attributed to "Creation's Lord" himself and its date is reckoned as coeval with the creation. The idea exists in the three chief Vedas and in the Brahmanas and Upanishads that Prajapati, "the lord and supporter of his creatures"—the Purusha (primeval male)—begotten before the world, becoming half immortal and half mortal in a body fit for sacrifice, offered himself for the devas (emancipated mortals) and for the benefit of the world; thereby making all subsequent sacrifice a reflection or figure of himself. The ideal of the Vedic Prajapati, mortal and yet divine, himself both priest and victim, who by death overcame death, has long since been lost in India. Among the many gods of the Hindu pantheon none has ever come forward to claim the vacant throne once revered by Indian rishis. No other than the Jesus of the Gospels—"the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"—has ever appeared to fulfill this primitive idea of redemption by the efficacy of sacrifice; and when this Christian truth is preached it ought not to sound strange to Indian ears. An eminent Hindu preacher has said that no one can be a true Hindu without being a true Christian.

Sacrifice Co-
eval with Crea-
tion.


But one of the saddest and most disastrous facts of the India of today is that modern Brahmanism, like modern Parsiism, is fast losing its old ideas, relaxing its hold on the more spiritual portions, the distinctive tenets, of the ancient faith. Happily, however, a reaction has set in, mainly through the exertions of these scholars and of the Arya Somaj; and the more thoughtful minds are earnestly seeking to recover from their sacred books some of the buried treasures of the past.

For ideas of a divine revelation, "Word of God," communicated directly to inspired sages or rishis, according to a theory of inspiration

higher than that of any other religion in the world, is perfectly familiar to Hindus, and is, indeed, universally entertained. Yet the conclusion reached is this: That a careful comparison of religions brings out this striking contrast between the Bible and all other scriptures; it establishes its satisfying character in distinction from the seeking spirit of other faiths. The Bible shows God in quest of man rather than man in quest of God. It meets the questions raised in the philosophies of the east, and supplies their only true solution.

Idea of a Di-
vine Revela-
tion.

The Vedas present "a shifting play of lights and shadows; sometimes the light seems to grow brighter, but the day never comes." For, on examining them, we note a remarkable fact. While they show that the spiritual needs and aspirations of humanity are the same—the same travail of the soul as it bears the burdens of existence—and contain many beautiful prayers for mercy and help, we fail to find a single text that purports to be a divine answer to prayer, an explicit promise of divine forgiveness, an expression of experienced peace and delight in God, as the result of assured pardon and reconciliation. There is no realization of ideas. The Bible alone is the Book of Divine Promise—the revelation of the "exceeding riches of God's grace—" shining with increasing brightness till the dawn of perfect day. And for this reason it is unique, not so much in its ideas, as in its vitality; a living and regulating force, embodied in a personal, historic Christ, and charged with unfailing inspiration.



Hindu Temple, Colombo, Ceylon.

Hinduism.

Paper by MANILAL N. DVIVEDI, of Bombay, India.



INDUISM is a wide term, but at the same time a vague term. The word Hindu was invented by the Mohammedan conquerors of Aryavata, the historical name of India, and it denotes all who reside beyond the Indus. Hinduism, therefore, correctly speaking is no religion at all. It embraces within its wide intention all shades of thought, from the atheistic Jainas and Bauddhas to the theistic Sampradaikas and Samajists and the rationalistic Advaytins. But we may agree to use the term in the sense of that body of philosophical and religious principles which are professed in part or whole by the inhabitants of India. I shall confine

myself in this short address to unfolding the meaning of this term, and shall try to show the connection of this meaning with the ancient records of India, the

Vedas.

Before entering upon this task permit me, however, to make a few preliminary observations. And first it would greatly help us on if we had settled a few points, chief among them the meaning of the word religion. Religion is defined by Webster generally as any system of worship. This is, however, not in the sense in which the word is understood in India. The word has a threefold connotation. Religion divides itself into physices, ontology and ethics, and without being that vague something which is set up to satisfy the requirements of the emotional side of human nature, it resolves itself into that rational demonstration of the universe which serves as the basis of a practical system of ethical rules. Every Indian religion—for let it be understood there is quite a number of them—has therefore some theory of the physical universe, complemented by some sort of spiritual government, and a code of ethics consistent with that theory and that government. So, then, it would be a mistake to take away any one phase of any Indian religion and pronounce upon its merits on a partial survey.

What Hindu-
ism Embraces.

Fanciful
Theories.

The next point I wish to clear is the chronology of the Purānas. I mean the chronology given in the Purānas. Whereas the Indian religion claims extravagant antiquity for its teachings, the tendency of Christian writers has been to cramp everything within the narrow period of 6,000 years. But for the numerous vagaries and fanciful theories these extremes give birth to, this point would have no interest for us at the present moment. With the rapid advance made by physical science in the west, numerous testimonies have been unearthed to show the untenableness of Biblical chronology, and it would be safe to hold the mind in mental suspense in regard to this matter. The third point is closely connected with the second. Every one has a natural inclination toward his native land and language, and particularly toward the religion in which he is brought up. It, however, behooves men of impartial judgment to look upon all religions as so many different explanations of the dealings of the Supreme with men of varying culture and nationality. It is impossible to do justice to these themes in this place, but we will start with these necessary precautions that the following pages may not appear to make any extraordinary demands upon the intelligence of those brought up in the atmosphere of the so-called "Oriental research" in the west.

Indian Philo-
sophic Thought.

We may now address ourselves to the subject before us. At least six different and well marked stages are visible in the history of Indian philosophic thought, and each stage appears to have left its impress upon the meaning of the word Hinduism. The six stages may be enumerated thus: (1) the Vedas; (2) the Sutra; (3) the Darśana; (4) the Purāna; (5) the Samapradāya; (6) the Samāja. Each of these is enough to fill several volumes, and all I can attempt here is a cursory survey of "Hinduism," in the religious sense of the word.

1. Let us begin with the Vedas. The oldest of the four Vedas is admittedly the Rigveda. It is the most ancient record of the Aryan nation, nay, of the first humanity our earth knows of. Traces of a very superior degree of civilization and art, found at every page, prevent us from regarding these records as containing only the outpourings of the minds of pastoral tribes ignorantly wondering at the grand phenomena of nature. We find in the Vedas a highly superior order of rationalistic thought pervading all the hymns, and we have ample reasons to conclude that the childish poetry of primitive hearts, Agni and Vishne and Indra and Rudra, are indeed so many names of different gods, but each of them had really a threefold aspect.

Vishne, for example, in his terrestrial or temporal aspect, is the physical sun; in his corporal aspect he is the soul of every being, and in his spiritual aspect he is the all-pervading essence of the cosmos. In their spiritual aspect all Gods are one, for well says the well-known text, "only one essence the wise declare in many ways." And this conception of the spiritual unity of the cosmos as found in the Vedas is the crux of western oriental research. The learned doctors are unwilling to see more than the slightest trace of this conception in the Veda, for, say they, it is all nature worship, the invocation of different inde-

pendent powers which held the wondering mind of this section of primitive humanity in submissive admiration and praise. However well this may accord with the psychological development of the human mind, there is not the slightest semblance of evidence in the Vedas to show that these records belong to that hypothetical period of human progress.

In the Vedas there are marks everywhere of the recognition of the idea of one God, the God of nature, manifesting Himself in many forms. This word "God" is one of those which have been the stumbling block of philosophy. God, in the sense of a personal Creator of the universe, is not known in the Veda, and the highest effort of rationalistic thought in India has been to see God in the totality of all that is. And, indeed, it is doubtful whether philosophy, be it that of a Kant or a Hegel, has ever accomplished anything more. It hereby stands to reason that men who are so far admitted to be Kants and Hegels should, in other respects, be only in a state of childish wonderment at the phenomena of nature.

I humbly beg to differ from those who see in monotheism, in the recognition of a personal God apart from nature, the acme of intellectual development. I believe that is only a kind of anthropomorphism which the human mind stumbles upon in its first efforts to understand the unknown. The ultimate satisfaction of human reason and emotion lies in the realization of that universal essence which is the all. And I hold an irrefragable evidence that this idea is present in the Veda, the numerous gods their invocations notwithstanding. This idea of the formless all, the Sat—*i. e.*, esse-being—called Atman and Brahman in the Upanishads, and further explained in the Darsanas, is the central idea of the Veda, nay, the root idea of the Hindu religion in general.

There are several reasons for the opposite error of finding nothing more than the worship of many gods in the Vedas. In the first place, western scholars are not quite clear as to the meaning of the word Veda. Native commentators have always insisted that the word Veda does not mean the Samhita only, but the Brahmanas and the Upanishads as well; whereas, oriental scholars have persisted in understanding the word in the first sense alone. The Samhita is no doubt a collection of hymns to different powers and, taken by itself, it is most likely to produce the impression that monotheism was not understood at the time. Apart, however, from clear cases to the contrary observable by any one who can read between the lines, even in the Samhita, a consideration of that portion along with the other two parts of the Veda will clearly show the untenableness of the Orientalist position. The second source of error, if I may be allowed the liberty to refer to it, is the religious bias already touched upon at the outset. If, then, we grasp the central idea of the Vedas we shall understand the real meaning of Hinduism as such.

Understand-
ing of the Word
Veda.

The other conditions of the word will unfold themselves, by and by, as we proceed. We need not go into any further analysis of the Veda, and may come at once to the second phase of religious thought,

the Sutras and Smritis, based on the ritualistic portion of Vedic literature.

The Sutra
Period,

2. Sutra means an aphorism. In this period we have aphoristic works bearing upon ritual, philosophy, morals, grammar and other subjects. Though this period is distinct from the Vedic and subsequent periods, it is entirely unsafe to assume that this or any other period occurred historically in the order of succession adopted for the purpose of this essay. Between the Veda and Sutra lie the Brahmanas, with the Upanishads and Aryanakas and the Smritis. The books called Brahmanas and Upanishads form part of the Veda, as explained before; the former explaining the ritualistic use and application of Vedic hymns, the latter systematizing the unique philosophy contained in them. What the Brahmanas explained allegorically, and in the quaint phraseology of the Veda, the Smritis, which followed them, explained in plain, systematic, modern Sanskrit. As the Veda is called *Siruti*, or something handed down orally from teacher to pupil, these later works are called Smritis, something remembered and recorded after the Smritis. The Sutras deal with the Brahmanas and Smritis on the one hand, and with the Upanishads on the other. These latter we shall reserve for consideration in the next stage of religious development, but it should never be supposed that the central idea of the All as set forth in the Upanishads had at this period, or indeed at any period, ceased to govern the whole of the religious activity of India. The Sutras are divided principally into the *Grhva*, *Sranta* and *Dharma* Sutras. The first deals with the Smritis, the second with the Brahmanas, and the third with the law as administered by Smritis. The first set of Sutras deals with the institution of Varnas and *Asramas* and with the various rites and duties belonging to them. The second class of Sutras deals with the larger Vedic sacrifices, and those of the third deals with that special law subsequently known as Hindu law. It will be interesting to deal 'en masse' with these subjects in this place—leaving the subject of law out of consideration.

And first let us say a few words about caste. In Vedic times the whole Indian people is spoken of broadly as the Aryas and the *Anaryas*. *Arya* means respectable and fit to be gone, from the root R "to go," and not an agriculturist, as the orientalist would have it, from a fanciful root *ar*, to till. The Aryas are divided into four sections called Varnas, men of white color, the others being *Avarnas*. These four sections comprise, respectively, priests, warriors, merchants and cultivators, artisans and menials, called Brahmanas, *Ksatriyas* and *Sudras*. These divisions, however, are not at all mutually exclusive in the taking of food or the giving in marriage of sons and daughters. Nay, men used to be promoted or degraded to superior or inferior Varnas according to individual deserts. In the Sutra period we find all this considerably altered. *Manu* speaks of promiscuous intercourse among Varnas and *Avarnas* leading to the creation of several jatis, sections known by the incident of birth, instead of by color as before.

This is the beginning of that exclusive system of castes which has

proved the bane of India's welfare. Varna and Jati are foremost among many other important features which we find grafted on Hinduism in this period. We find in works of this period that the life of every man is distributed into four periods—student life, family life, forest life and life of complete renunciation. This institution, too, has become a part of the meaning of the word Hinduism. The duties and relations of Varnas, Jatis and Asramas are clearly defined in the Sutras and Smritis, but with these we need not concern ourselves except in this general manner. I can, however, not pass over the well-known subject of the Samskaras, certain rites which under the Sutras every Hindu is bound to perform if he professes to be a Hindu. Those rites, twenty-five in all, may be divided into three groups—rites incumbent, rites optional and rites incidental. The incumbent rites are such as every householder is bound to observe for securing immunity from sin. Every householder must rise early in the morning, wash himself, revise what he has learned and teach it to others without remuneration. In the next place he must worship the family gods and spend some time in silent communion with whatever power he adores. He should then satisfy his prototypes in heaven—the lunar Pitris—by offerings of water and seamen seeds. Then he should reconcile the powers of the air by suitable oblations, ending by inviting some stray comer to dinner with him. Before the householder has thus done his duty by his teachers, gods and Pitris and men, he cannot go about his business without incurring the bitterest sin.

The optional rites refer to certain ceremonies in connection with the dead, whose souls are supposed to rest with the lunar Pitris for about a thousand years or more before reincarnation. These are called *sraddhas*, ceremonies, whose essence is *sraddha*, faith. There are a few other ceremonies in connection with the commencement or suspension of studies, and these, together with the *sraddhas*, just referred to, make up the four optional Samskaras, which the Smritis allow every one to perform according to his means.

By far the most important are the sixteen incidental Samskaras. I shall, however, dismiss the first nine of these with simple enumeration. Four of the nine refer, respectively, to the time of first cohabitation, conception, quickening and certain sacrifices, etc., performed with the last. The other five refer to rites performed at the birth of a child and subsequently at the time of giving it a name, of giving it food, of taking it out of doors, and at the time of shaving its head in some sacred place on an auspicious day. The tenth, with the four subsidiary rites connected with it, is the most important of all. It is called *Upanavana*, the "taking to the gurnu," but it may yet better be described as initiation. The four subsidiary rites make up the four pledges which the neophyte takes on initiation. This rite is performed on male children alone at the age of from five to eight in the case of Brahmanas, and a year or two later in the case of others, except Sudras, who have nothing to do with any of the rites save marriage. The young boy is given a peculiarly prepared thread of cotton to wear con

Incidental
Samskaras.

stantly on the body, passing it crossways over the left shoulder and under the right arm. It is a mark of initiation which consists in the imparting of the sacred secret of the family and the order to the boy, by his father and the family gurnu.

The boy pledges himself to his teacher, under whose protection he henceforth begins to reside, to carry out faithfully the four vows he has taken, viz., study, observance of religion, complete celibacy and truthfulness. This period of pupilage ends after nine years at the shortest, and thirty-six years at the longest period. The boy then returns home, after duly rewarding his teacher, and finds out some suitable girl for his wife.

This return in itself makes up the fifteen Samskars. The last, but not the least, is the vivaha—matrimony. The sutras and smritis are most clear on the injunctions about the health, learning, competency, family connections, beauty, and above all, personal liking of principal parties to a marriage. Marriages between children of the same blood or family are prohibited. As to age, the books are very clear in ordaining that there must be a distance of at least ten years between the respective ages of wife and husband, and that the girl may be married at any age before attaining puberty, preferably at ten or eleven, though she may be affianced at about eight or nine. Be it remembered that marriage and consummation of marriage are two different things in India, as a consideration of this Samskara, in connection with the first of the nine enumerated at the beginning of this group, will amply show, several kinds of marriage are enumerated, and among the eight generally given we find marriage by courting as well.

The Marriage
Ceremony.

The marriage ceremony is performed in the presence of priests and gods represented by fire on the altar, and the tie of love is sanctified by Vedic mantras, repetition of which forms indeed an indispensable part of every rite and ceremony. The pair exchanges vows of fidelity and indissoluble love and bind themselves never to separate even after death. The wife is supposed henceforth to be as much dependent on her husband as he on her, for as the wife has to complete the fulfillment of love as her principal duty, the husband has, in return, the entire maintenance of the wife, temporally and spiritually, as his principal duty. When the love thus fostered has sufficiently educated the man into entire forgetfulness of self, he may retire, either alone or with his wife, into some secluded forest and prepare himself for the last period of life, complete renunciation, *i. e.*, renunciation of all individual attachment, of personal likes and dislikes, and realization of the All in the eternal self-sacrifice of universal love.

It goes without saying that widow remarriage as such is unknown in this system of life, and the liberty of woman is more a sentiment than something practically wanting in this careful arrangement. Woman as woman has her place in nature quite as much as man as man, and if there is nothing to hamper the one or the other in the discharge of his or her functions as marked out by nature, liberty beyond this limit means shadows, disorder and irresponsible license. And

indeed nature never meant her living embodiment of lone woman to be degraded to a footing of equality with her partner, to fight the hard struggle for existence, or to allow love's pure stream to be defiled by being led into channels other than those marked out for it. This is in substance the spirit of the ancient Sastras when they limit the sphere of woman's action to the house, and the flow of her heart to one and one channel alone.

3. We arrive thus in natural succession to the third period of Aryan religion, the Darsanas, which enlarge upon the central idea of Atman, or Brahma, enunciated in the Veda and developed in the Upanishads. It is interesting to allude to the Charvakas, the materialists of Indian philosophy, and to the Jainas and the Buddhas, who, though opposed to the Charvakas, are anti-Brahmanical, in that they do not recognize the authority of the Veda and preach an independent gospel of love and mercy. These schisms, however, had an indifferent effect in imparting fresh activity to the rationalistic spirit of the Aryan sages, lying dormant under the growing incumbrances of the ritualism of the Sutras.

The central idea of the All as we found it in the Veda is further developed in the Upanishads. In the Sutra period several sutra works were composed setting forth in a systematic manner the main teaching of the Upanishads. Several works came to be written in imitation of these subjects closely connected with the main issues of philosophy and metaphysics. This spirit of philosophic activity gave rise to the six well known Darsanas, or schools of philosophy. Here again it is necessary to enter the caution that the Darsanas do not historically belong to this period, for, notwithstanding this, their place in the general development of thought and the teachings they embody are as old as the Veda, or even older.

Schools of
Philosophy.

The six Darsanas are Nyaya, Vaiseshika, Sankhya, Xoga, Mimansa and Vedanta, more conveniently grouped as the two Nyayas, the two Sankhyas and the two Mimansas. Each of these must require at least a volume to itself, and all I can do in this place is to give the merest outline of the conclusions maintained in each. Each of the Darsanas has that triple aspect which we found at the outset in the meaning of the word religion, and it will be convenient to state the several conclusions in that order. The Nyaya then is exclusively concerned with the nature of knowledge and the instruments of knowledge, and while discussing these it sets forth a system of logic not yet surpassed by any existing system in the west. The Vaiseshika is a complement of the Nyaya, and while the latter discusses the metaphysical aspect of the universe, the former works out the atomic theory and resolves the whole of the namable world into seven categories.

So, then, physically, the two Nyayas advocate the atomic theory of the universe. Ontologically they believe that these atoms move in accordance with the will of an extra-cosmic personal creature called Isvara. Every being has a soul called Jiva, whose attributes are de-

sire, intelligence, pleasure, pain, merit, demerit, etc. Knowledge arises from the union of Jiva and mind, the atomic *manas*. The highest happiness lies in Jiva's becoming permanently free from its attribute of misery. This freedom can be obtained by the grace of *Iswara*, pleased with the complete devotion of the Jiva. The *Veda* and the *Upanishad* are recognized as authority, in so far as they are the word of this *Iswara*.

Multiplicity
of Souls.

The *Sankhyas* differed entirely from the *Naiyayikas* in that they repudiated the idea of a personal creator of the universe. They argued that if the atoms were in themselves sufficiently capable of forming themselves into the universe, the idea of a God was quite superfluous. And as to intelligence the *Sankhyas* maintained that it is inherent in nature. These philosophers, therefore, hold that the whole universe is evolved by slow degrees, in a natural manner, from one primordial matter called *mulaprakriti*, and that *purusa*, the principle of intelligence, is always co-ordinate with, though ever apart from, *mulaprakriti*. Like the *Naiyayikas*, they believe in the multiplicity of *purusas*—souls; but unlike them they deny the necessity, as well as the existence, of an extra-cosmic God. Whence, they have earned for themselves the name of atheistic *Sankhyas*. They resort to the *Vedas* and *Upanishads* for support so far as it may serve their purpose, and otherwise accept in general the logic of the ten *Naiyayikas*.

The *Sankhyas* place the *summum bonum* in "life according to nature." They endow primordial matter with three attributes—passivity, restlessness and crossness. *Prakriti* continues in endless evolution under the influence of the second of these attributes, and the *purusa* falsely takes the action on himself and feels happy or miserable. When a *purusa* has his *prakriti* brought to the state of passivity by analytical knowledge (which is the meaning of the word *sankhya*), he ceases to feel himself happy or miserable and remains in native peace. This is the sense in which those philosophers understand the phrase "life according to nature."

The other *Sankhya*, more popularly known as the *Yogo-Darsana*, accepts the whole of the cosmology of the first *Sankhya*, but only adds to it a hypothetical *Iswara* and largely expands the ethical side of the teaching by setting forth several physical and psychological rules and exercises capable of leading to the last state of happiness called *Kanivalya*—life according to nature. This is theistic *Sankhya*.

The two *Mimansas* next call our attention. These are the orthodox *Darsanas* par excellence, and as such are in direct touch with the *Veda* and the *Upanishads*, which continue to govern them from beginning to end. *Mimansa* means inquiry, and the first preliminary is called *Purva-Mimansa*, the second *Uttara-Mimansa*. The object of the first is to determine the exact meaning and value of the injunctions and prohibitions given out in the *Veda*, and that of the second is to explain the esoteric teachings of the *Upanishads*. The former, therefore, does not trouble itself about the nature of the universe or about the ideas of God and soul. It tells only of *Dharma*, religious merit,

which, according to its teaching, arises in the next world from strict observance of Vedic duties. This Mimamsa, fitly called the *purva*, a preliminary Mimamsa, we may thus pass over without any further remark. The most important Darsana of all is by far the *Uttara*, or final Mimamsa, popularly known as the Vedanta, the philosophy taught in the Upanishads as the end of the Veda.

The Vedanta emphasizes the idea of the All, the universal Atman or Brahman, set forth in the Upanishads, and maintains the unity not only of the Cosmos but of all intelligence in general. The All is self-illuminated, all thought (gnosis), the very being of the universe. Being implies thought, and the All may in Vedic phraseology be aptly described as the essence of thought and being. The Vedanta is a system of absolute idealism in which subject and object are rolled into one unique consciousness, the realization whereof is the end and aim of existence, the highest bliss—*Moksha*. This state of *Moksha* is not anything to be accomplished or brought about—it is in fact the very being of all existence; but experience stands in the way of complete realization by creating imaginary distinctions of subject and object. This system, besides being the orthodox Darsana, is philosophically an improvement upon all previous speculations.

The Nyaya is superseded by the Sankya, whose distinction of matter and intelligence is done away with in this philosophy of absolute idealism, which has endowed the phrase "life according to nature" with an entirely new and more rational meaning. For, in its ethics, this system teaches not only the brotherhood, but the Atma-hood *Abhedha*, oneness, of not only man but of all beings, of the whole universe. The light of the other Darsanas pales before the blaze of unity and love lighted at the altar of the Veda by this sublime philosophy, the shelter of minds like Plato, Pythagoras, Bruno, Spinoza, Hegel, Schopenhauer in the west, and Krisna, Vyasa, Sankara and others in the east.

We cannot but sum up at this point. Hinduism adds one more attribute to its connotation in this period, viz., that of being a believer in the truths of one or other of these Darsanas, or of one or other of the three anti-Brahmanical schisms. And with this we must take leave of the great Darsana sages and come to the period of the Puranas.

4. The subtleties of the Darsanas were certainly too hard for ordinary minds, and some popular exposition of the basic ideas of philosophy and religion was indeed very urgently required. And this necessity began to be felt the more keenly as Sanskrit began to die out as a speaking language and the people to decline in intelligence, in consequence of frequent inroads from abroad. No idea more happy could have been conceived at this stage than that of devising certain tales and fables calculated at once to catch the imagination and enlist the faith of even the most ignorant, and at the same time to suggest to the initiated a clear outline of the secret doctrine of old. It is exactly because Orientalists don't understand this double aspect of Pauranika

Period of the
Puranas.

myths that they amuse themselves with philological quibbles and talk of the religion of the Puranas as something entirely puerile and not deserving the name of religion. We ought, however, to bear in mind that the Puranas are closely connected with the Vedas, the Sutras and the Darsanas, and all they claim to accomplish is a popular exposition of the basic ideas of philosophy, religion and morality set forth in them.

In other words, the Puranas are nothing more nor less than broad, clear commentaries on the ancient teaching of the Vedas. For example, it is not because Vyasa, the author of the Puranas, forgot that Vishnu was the name of the sun in the Veda that he talked of a separate god of that name in the Puranas, endowing him with all mortal attributes. This is how the orientalist method of interpretation would dispose of the question. The Hindus have better confidence in the insight of Vyasa, and could at once see that inasmuch as he knew perfectly well what part the sun plays in the evolution, maintenance and dissolution of the world, he represented him symbolically as God Vishnu, the all-pervading, with Laksmi, a personification of the life and prosperity which emanate from the sun for his consort, with the anauta—popularly the snake of that name, but esoterically the endless circle of eternity—for his couch, and with the eagle representing the many antarc cycle for his vehicle. There is in this one symbol sufficient material for the ignorant to build their faith upon and nourish the religious sentiment, and for the initiate to see in it the true secret of Vedic religion. And this nature of the Puranas is an indirect proof that the Vedas are not mere poetical effusions of primitive man nor a conglomeration of solar myths disguised in different shapes.

The cycles just referred to put me in mind of another aspect of Puranika mythology. The theory of cycles known as Kalpas, Manvantaras and Yugas is clearly set forth in the Puranas and appears to make exorbitant demands upon our credulity. The Kalpa of the Puranas is a cycle of 4,320,000,000 years and the world continues in activity for one Kalpa, after which it goes into dissolution and remains in that condition for another Kalpa, to be followed by a fresh period of activity. Each Kalpa has fourteen well-marked subcycles called Manvantaras, each of which is again made up of four periods called Yugas. The name Manvantara means time between the Manus, and Manu means "with one mind," that is to say, humanity, the whole suggesting that a Manvantara is the period between one humanity and another on this globe. Whence it will also be clear why the present Manvantara is called Vaivasvata, "belonging to the sun," for, as is well established, on that luminary depends the life and being of man on this earth.

This theory of cycles and subcycles is amply corroborated by modern geological and astronomical researches, and considerable light may be thrown on the evolution of man if with reason as our guide we study the aspect of the Puranas. The theory of Simian descent is confronted in the Puranas with a theory more in accord with reason and

experience. But I have no time to go into the details of each and every Puranika myth. I can only assure you, gentlemen, that all that is taught in the Puranas is capable of being explained consistently in accord with the main body of ancient theosophy expounded in the Vedas, the Sutras and the Darsanas. We must only free ourselves from what Herbert Spencer calls the religious bias and learn to look facts honestly in the face.

I must say a word here about idol worship, for it is exactly in or after the Pauranika period that idols came to be used in India. It may be said without the least fear of contradiction that no Indian idolater as such believes the piece of stone, metal or wood before his eyes to be his God in any sense of the word. He takes it only as a symbol of the all-pervading and uses it as a convenient object for purposes of concentration, which, being accomplished, he does not hesitate to throw it away. The religion of the Tantras, which plays an important part in this period, has considerable influence on this question, and the symbology they taught as typical of several important processes of evolution has been made the basic idea in the formation of idols. Idols, too, have, therefore, a double purpose—that of perpetuating a teaching as old as the world and that of serving as convenient aids to concentration.


Idol Worship.

These interpretations of Puranika myths find ample corroboration in the myths that are met with in all ancient religions of the world; and these explanations of idol worship have an exact parallel application to the worship of the Tau in Egypt, of the cross in Christendom, of fire in Zoroastrianism, and of the Kaba in Mohammedanism.

With these necessarily brief explanations we may try to see what influence the Puranas have had on Hinduism in general. It is true the Puranas have added no new connotation to the name, but the one very important lesson they have taught the Hindu is the principle of universal toleration. The Puranas have distinctly taught the unity of the All, and satisfactorily demonstrated that every creed and worship is but one of the many ways to the realization of the All. A Hindu would not condemn any man for his religion, for he has well laid to heart the celebrated couplet of the Bhagavate: "Worship, in whatever form, rendered to whatever God, reaches the Supreme, as rivers, rising from whatever source, all flow into the ocean."

5. And thus, gentlemen, we come to the fifth period, the Sampradayas. The word sampradaya means tradition, the teaching handed down from teacher to pupil. The whole Hindu religion considered from the beginning to the present time is one vast field of thought, capable of nourishing every intellectual plant of whatever degree of vigor and luxuriance. The one old teaching was the idea of the All, usually known as the Advaita or the Vedanta. In the ethical aspect of this philosophy stress has been laid on knowledge (gnosis) and free action. Under the debasing influence of a foreign yoke these sober paths of knowledge and action had to make room for devotion and grace. On devotion and grace rest their principal ethical tenets,

The Sampradaya Period.



Three important schools of philosophy arose in the period after the Puranas. Besides the ancient Advaita we have the Dvaita, the Visuddhadvaita and the Visishtadvaita schools of philosophy in this period. The first is purely dualistic postulation, the separate yet co-ordinate existence of mind and matter. The second and third profess to be Unitarian, but in a considerably modified sense of the word.

The Visuddhadvaita teaches the unity of the cosmos, but it insists on the All having certain attributes which endow it with the desire to manifest itself as the cosmos. The third system is purely dualistic, though it goes by the name of modified Unitarianism. It maintains the unity of chit (soul), achet (matter) and Isvara (God), each in its own sphere, the third number of this trinity governing all and pervading the whole, though not apart from the cosmos. Thus widely differing in their philosophy from the Advaita, these three Sampradayas teach a system of ethics entirely opposed to the one taught in that ancient school called Dharma in the Advaita. They displaced Jnana by Bhakti, and Karma by Prasada; that is to say, in other words, they placed the highest happiness in obtaining the grace of God by entire devotion, physical, mental, moral and spiritual. The teachers of each of these Sampradayas are known as Acharyas, like Sankara, the first great Acharya of the ancient Advaita. The Acharyas of the new Sampradayas belong all to the eleventh and twelfth centuries of the Christian era.

Every Acharya develops his school of thought from the Upanishads, the Vedanta Sutras, and from that sub-sublime poem, "The Bhagavadgita," the crest jewel of the Maha Bharata. The new Acharyas, following the example of Sankara, have commented upon these works. And have thus applied each his own system to the Veda.

In the Sampradayas we see the last of the pure Hinduism, for the sacred Devanagari ceases henceforth to be the medium even of religious thought. The four principal Sampradayas have found numerous imitators, and we have the Saktas, the Saivas, the Pasupatas and many others, all deriving their teaching from the Vedas, the Darśanas, the Puranas and the Tantras. But beyond this we find quite a lot of teachers: Ramananda, Kabira, Dadu, Nanaka, Chaitanya, Sahajananda and many others holding influence over small tracts over all India.

None of these have a claim to the title of Acharya or the founders of a new school of thought, for all that these noble souls did was to explain one or another of the Sampradayas in the current vernacular of the people. The teachings of these men are called Panthas—mere ways to religion as opposed to the traditional teachings of the Sampradayas.

The bearing of these Sampradayas and Panthas, the fifth edition, as it were, of the ancient faith on Hinduism in general, is not worthy of note except in the particular that henceforth every Hindu must belong to one of the Sampradayas or Panthas.

6. This brings us face to face with the India of today and Hinduism as it stands at present. It is necessary at the outset to under-

Numerous
Imitators.

stand the principal forces at work in bringing about the change we are going to describe. In the ordinary course of events one would naturally expect to stop at the religion of the Sampradayas and Panthas. The advent of the English followed by the educational policy they have maintained for half a century has, however, worked several important changes in the midst of the people, not the least important of which are those which affect religion. Before the establishment of British rule and the peace and security that followed in its train, people had forgotten the ancient religion, and Hinduism had dwindled down into a mass of irrational superstition reared on ill understood Pauranika myths. The spread of education set people to thinking, and a spirit of "reformation" swayed the minds of all active-minded men.

The chance work was, however, no reformation at all. Under the auspices of materialistic science, and education guided by materialistic principles, the mass of superstition then known as Hinduism was scattered to the winds, and atheism and skepticism ruled supreme. But this state of things was not destined to endure in religious India. The revival of Sanskrit learning brought to light the immortal treasures of things buried in the Vedas, Upanishads, Sutras, Darsanas and Puranas, and the true work of reformation commenced with the revival of Sanskrit. Several pledged their allegiance to their time-honored philosophy.

But there remained many bright intellects given over to materialistic thought and civilization. These could not help thinking that the religion of those whose civilization they admired must be the only true religion. Thus they began to read their own notions in texts of the Upanishads and the Vedas. They set up an extra-cosmic, yet all-pervading and formless creature, whose grace every soul desirous of liberation must attract by complete devotion. This sounds like the teaching of the Visishthadvaita Sampradaya, but it may safely be said that the idea of an extra-cosmic personal creation without form is an un-Hindu idea. And so also is the belief of these innovators in regard to their negation of the principle of reincarnation. The body of this teaching goes by the name of the Brahmo-Somaj, which has drawn itself still further away from Hinduism by renouncing the institutions of Varnas and the established law of marriage, etc.

The society which next calls our attention is the Arya-Samaja of Swami Dayananda. This society subscribes to the teaching of the Nyaya-Darsana and professes to revive the religion of the Sutras in all social rites and observances. This Somaj claims to have found out the true religion of the Aryas, and it is of course within the pale of Hinduism, though the merit of their claim yet remains to be seen.

The third influence at work is that of the Theosophical society. It is pledged to a religion contained in the Upanishads of India, in the book of the Dead of Egypt, in the teachings of Confucius and Lao Tse in China, and of Buddha and Zoroaster in Thibet and Persia, in the Kabala of the Jews and in the Sufism of the Mohammedans; and

The Theophi-
al Society.

it appears to be full of principles contained in the Advaita and Yoga philosophies. It cannot be gainsaid that this society has created much interest in religious studies all over India and has set earnest students to studying their ancient books with better lights and fresher spirits than before. Time alone can test the outcome of this or any other movement. The term Hinduism, then, has nothing to add to its meaning from this period of the Samajas. The Brahmo-Somaj widely differs from Hinduism and the Aryasamaja, or Theosophical society does not profess anything new.

Hinduism
Summed Up.

To sum up, then, Hinduism may in general be understood to connote the following principal attributes: (1) Belief in the existence of a spiritual principle in nature and in the principle of reincarnation. (2) Observance of a complete tolerance and of the Samskaras, being in one of the Varnas and Asramas, and being bound by the Hindu law. This is the general meaning of the term, but in its particular bearing it implies: (3) Belonging to one of the Darsanas, Sampradayas or Panthas, or to one of the anti-Brahmanical schisms.

Having ascertained the general and particular scope and meaning of Hinduism, I would ask you, gentlemen of this august parliament, whether there is not in Hinduism material sufficient to allow of its being brought in contact with the other great religions of the world by subsuming them all under one common genus?

In other words, is it not possible to enunciate a few principles of universal religion which every man who professes to be religious must accept, apart from his being a Hindu or a Buddhist, a Mohammedan or a Parsee, a Christian or a Jew?

If religion is not wholly that something which satisfies the cravings of the emotional nature of man, but is that rational demonstration of the cosmos, which shows at once the why and wherefore of existence, provides the eternal and all-embracing foundation of natural ethics and by showing to humanity the highest ideal of happiness realizable, excites and shows the means of satisfying the emotional part of man; if, I say, religion is all this, all questions of particular religious professions and their comparative value must resolve themselves into simple problems workable with the help of unprejudiced reason and intelligence. In other words, religion, instead of being a mere matter of faith, might well become the solid province of reason, and a science of religion may not be so much a dream as is imagined by persons pledged to certain conclusions. Holding, therefore, these views on the nature of religion, and having at heart the great benefit of a common basis of religion for all men, I would submit the following simple principles for your consideration:

Principles for
Consideration.


First. Belief in the existence of an ultramaterial principle in nature and in the unity of the All.

Second. Belief in reincarnation and salvation by action.

These two principles of a possible universal religion might stand or fall on their merits apart from the consideration of any philosophy or revelation that upholds them. I have every confidence no philos-

ophy would reject them, no science would gainsay them, no system of ethics would deny them, no religion which professes to be philosophic, scientific and ethical ought to shrink back from them. In them I see the salvation of man and the possibility of that universal love, which the world is so much in need of at the present moment.





W B CONNELL CO. - CHL

Dagoba (Sacred Shrine), Anuradhapura—Buried City, Ceylon.

The Contact of Christian and Hindu Thought; Points of Likeness and of Contrast.

Paper by REV. R. A. HUME, of New Haven, Conn.



WHEN Christian and Hindu thought first came into contact in India neither understood the other. This was for two reasons, one outward, the other inward. The outward reason was this. The Christian saw Hinduism at its worst. Polytheism, idolatry, a mythology explained by the Hindus themselves as teaching puerilities and sensualities in its many deities, caste rampant, ignorance widespread and profound; these are what the Christian first saw and supposed to be all of Hinduism. Naturally he saw little except evil in it.

The outward reason why the Hindu, at first contact with Christianity, failed to understand it was this: Speaking generally, every child of Hindu parents is of course a Hindu in religion, whatever his inmost thoughts or conduct. The Hindu had never conceived of such an anomaly as an un-Hindu child of Hindu parents. Much less had they conceived of an unchristian man from a country where Christianity was the religion. Seeing the early comers from the West killing the cow, eating beef, drinking wine, sometimes impure, sometimes bullying the wild Indian, the Hindu easily supposed that these men, from a country where Christianity was the religion, were Christians. In consequence they despised what they supposed was the Christian religion. They did not know that in truth it was the lack

Things Seem-
ingly Unlovely.

of Christianity which they were despising. Even in truly Christian men they saw things which seemed to them unlovely.

Moreover, Christianity was to the Hindu the religion of the conquerors of his country. For this outward reason at the first contact of Christianity and Hindu thought neither understood the other.

But there was an additional, an inward reason, why neither understood the other. It was the very diverse natures of the Hindu and the western mind. The Hindu mind is supremely introspective. It is an ever active mind which has thought about most things in "the three worlds," heaven, earth and the nether world. But it has seen them through the eye turned inwardly. The faculties of imagination and of abstract thought, the faculties which depend least on external tests of validity, are the strongest of the mental powers of the Hindu.

The Hindu Mind. The Hindu mind has well been likened to the game of chess, where there is the combination of an active mind and a passive body. A man may be strong at chess while not strong in meeting the problems of life. The Hindu mind cares little for facts, except inward ideal ones. When other facts conflict with such conceptions the Hindu disposes of them by calling them illusions.

A second characteristic of the Hindu mind is its intense longing for comprehensiveness. "Ekam eva advitiya," i. e., "There is but one and no second," is the most cardinal doctrine of philosophical Hinduism. So controlling is the Hindu's longing for unity that he places contradictory things side by side and serenely calls them alike or the same. To it, spirit and matter are essentially the same. In short, it satisfies its craving for unity by syncretism, i. e., by attempts to unify irreconcilable matters.

In marked contrast the western mind is practical and logical. First and foremost it cares for external and historical facts. It needs to cultivate the imagination. It naturally dwells on individuality and differences which it knows. It has to work for comprehension and unity. Above all, it recognizes that it should act as it thinks and believes. This extreme unlikeness between the Hindu and the western mind was the inward reason why, at the first contact of Christian and Hindu thought, neither understood the other.

But in the providence of God, the Father of both Christian and Hindu, these two diverse minds came into contact. Let us briefly trace the result.

Apart from the disgust at the unchristian conduct of some men from Christendom, when the Hindu thinker first looked at Christian thought he viewed with lofty contempt its pretensions and proposals.

Similarly, in its first contact with Hinduism the western mind saw only that which awakened contempt and pity. The Christian naturally supposed the popular Hinduism which he saw to be the whole of Hinduism, a system of many gods, of idols, of puerile and sometimes immoral mythologies, of mechanical and endless rites, of thorough-going caste, and often cruel caste. The Christian reported what he saw and many Christians felt pity. In accordance with the genius of the

western mind to act as it thinks, and under the inspiration of Christian motive, Christians began efforts to give Christian thought and life to India.

Longer and fuller contact between Christian and Hindu thought has caused a modification of first impressions.

Modification
of First Im-
pressions.

Both Christian and Hindu thought recognize an infinite being with whom is bound up man's rational and spiritual life. Both magnify the indwelling of this infinite being in every part of the universe. Both teach that this great being is ever revealing itself; that the universe is a unit, and that all things come under the universal laws of the infinite.

To Christianity God is the Heavenly Father, always and infinitely good; God is love.

To philosophical Hinduism, man is an emanation from the infinite, which, in the present stage of existence, is the exact result of this emanation in previous stages of existence. His moral sense is an illusion, for he cannot sin.

To popular Hinduism, man is partially what he is to philosophical Hinduism, determined by fate; partially he is thought of as a created being more or less sinful, dependent on God for favor or disfavor.

To Christianity, man is the child of his Heavenly Father, sinful and often erring, yet longed for and sought after by the Father.

To Christianity, caste, which teaches that a pure and learned man of humble origin is lower than an ignorant, proud man of higher origin, and that the shadow of the former could defile the latter, and that eating the same food together is a sin, is a disobedience to God.

To popular Hinduism, caste is ordained of God, and is the chief thing in religion. Says Sir Monier Williams: "The distinction of caste and the inherent superiority of one class over the three others were thought to be as much a law of nature and a matter of divine appointment as the creation of separate classes of animals with insurmountable differences of physical constitution, such as elephants, lions, horses and dogs."

Pre-eminently does the contrast between Christian and Hindu thought appear in God's relation to sin and the sinner.

Relation to
Sin and Sinner.

According to philosophical Hinduism there is no sin or sinner, or Saviour. According to popular Hinduism sin is mainly a matter of fate. According to Christianity sin is the only evil in the universe. But it is so evil that God grieves over it, suffers to put it away, and will suffer till it is put away. The revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ was pre-eminently of this character and to this end. To philosophical Hinduism (mukti), salvation is passing from the ignorance and illusion of conscious existence through unconsciousness into the infinite. To popular Hinduism, salvation is getting out of trouble into some safe place through merit somehow acquired. To Christianity, salvation is present deliverance from sin and moral union with God, begun here and to go on forever.

Hinduism as a Religion.

Paper by SWAMI VIVEKANANDA, of India.



THREE religions now stand in the world which have come down to us from time prehistoric—Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and Indaism. These all have received tremendous shocks and all of them prove by their revival their internal strength, but Indaism failed to absorb Christianity and was driven out of its place of birth by its all-conquering daughter. Sect after sect has arisen in India and seemed to shake the religion of the Vedas to its very foundations; but, like the waters of the seashore in a tremendous earthquake, it has receded only for a while, only to return in an all-absorbing flood, and when the tumult of the rush was over these sects had been all sucked in, absorbed and assimilated in the immense body of another faith.

From the high spiritual flights of philosophy, of which the latest discoveries of science seem like echoes, from the atheism of the Jains to the low ideas of idolatry and the multifarious mythologies, each and all have a place in the Hindu's religion.

Seemingly
Hopeless Con-
tradictions

Where then, the question arises, where then the common center to which all these widely diverging radii converge? Where is the common basis upon which all these seemingly hopeless contradictions rest? And this is the question which I shall attempt to answer.

The Hindus have received their religion through the revelation of the Vedas. They hold that the Vedas are without beginning and without end. It may sound ludicrous to this audience—how a book can be without beginning or end. But by the Vedas no books are meant. They mean the accumulated treasury of spiritual laws discovered by different persons in different times. Just as the law of gravitation existed before its discovery and would exist if all humanity forgot it, so with the laws that govern the spiritual world; the moral, ethical and spiritual relations between soul and soul and between individual spirits and the father of all spirits were there before their discovery and would remain even if we forgot them.



Narasima Charya. Lakshmi Narain. Swami Vivekananda. H. Dharmapa'a. V. B. Gandhi.

The discoverers of these laws are called Rishis and we honor them as perfected beings, and I am glad to tell this audience that some of the very best of them were women.

Here it may be said, that the laws as laws may be without end, but they must have had a beginning. The Vedas teach us that creation is without beginning or end. Science has proved to us that the sum total of the cosmic energy is the same throughout all time. Then, if there was a time when nothing existed, where was all this manifested energy? Some say it was in a potential form in God. But then God is sometimes potential and sometimes kinetic, which would make him mutable, and everything mutable is a compound, and everything compound must undergo that change which is called destruction. Therefore God would die. Therefore there never was a time when there was no creation.

Without Be-
ginning or
End.

Here I stand, and if I shut my eyes and try to conceive my existence, "I," "I," "I," what is the idea before me? The idea of a body. Am I, then, nothing but a combination of matter and material substances? The Vedas declare, "No." I am a spirit living in a body. I am not the body. The body will die, but I will not die. Here am I in this body, and when it will fail, still I will go on living. Also I had a past. The soul was not created from nothing, for creation means a combination, and that means a certain future dissolution. If, then, the soul was created, it must die. Therefore, it was not created. Some are born happy, enjoying perfect health, beautiful body, mental vigor, and with all wants supplied. Others are born miserable. Some are without hands or feet, some idiots, and only drag out a miserable existence. Why, if they are all created, why does a just and merciful God create one happy and the other unhappy? Why is He so partial? Nor would it mend matters in the least to hold that those who are miserable in this life will be perfect in a future life. Why should a man be miserable here in the reign of a just and merciful God?

In the second place, it does not give us any cause, but simply a cruel act of an all-powerful being, and therefore it is unscientific. There must have been causes, then, to make a man miserable or happy before his birth, and those were his past actions. Why may not all the tendencies of the mind and body be answered for by inherited aptitude from parents? Here are the two parallel lines of existence—one that of the mind, the other that of matter.

If matter and its transformation answer for all that we have, there is no necessity of supposing the existence of a soul. But it cannot be proved that thought has been evolved out of matter. We cannot deny that bodies inherit certain tendencies, but those tendencies only mean the physical configuration through which a peculiar mind alone can act in a peculiar way. Those peculiar tendencies in that soul have been caused by past actions. A soul with a certain tendency will take birth in a body which is the fittest instrument of the display of that tendency, by the laws of affinity. And this is in perfect accord with science, for science wants to explain everything by habit, and habit is

Mind and
Matter.

The Ocean of
Memory.

got through repetitions. So these repetitions are also necessary to explain the natural habits of a new-born soul. They were not got in this present life; therefore, they must have come down from past lives.

But there is another suggestion, taking all these for granted. How is it that I do not remember anything of my past life? This can be easily explained. I am now speaking English. It is not my mother tongue; in fact, not a word of my mother tongue is present in my consciousness; but, let me try to bring such words up, they rush into my consciousness. That shows that consciousness is the name only of the surface of the mental ocean, and within its depths are stored up all our experiences. Try and struggle and they will come up and you will be conscious.

This is the direct and demonstrative evidence. Verification is the perfect proof of a theory, and here is the challenge thrown to the world by Rishis. We have discovered precepts by which the very depths of the ocean of memory can be stirred up; follow them and you will get a complete reminiscence of your past life.

So then the Hindu believes that he is a spirit. Him the sword cannot pierce, him the fire cannot burn, him the water cannot melt, him the air cannot dry. He believes every soul is a circle whose circumference is nowhere, but whose center is located in a body, and death means the change of this center from body to body. Nor is the soul bound by the condition of matter. In its very essence it is free, unbound, holy and pure and perfect. But somehow or other it has got itself bound down by matter, and thinks of itself as matter.

Thralldom of
Matter.

Why should the free, perfect and pure being be under the thralldom of matter? How can the perfect be deluded into the belief that he is imperfect? We have been told that the Hindus shirk the question and say that no such question can be there, and some thinkers want to answer it by the supposing of one or more quasi perfect beings, and use big scientific names to fill up the gap. But naming is not explaining. The question remains the same. How can the perfect become the quasi perfect; how can the pure, the absolute, change even a microscopic particle of its nature? The Hindu is sincere. He does not want to take shelter under sophistry. He is brave enough to face the question in a manly fashion. And his answer is, "I do not know." I do not know how the perfect being, the soul, came to think of itself as imperfect, as joined and conditioned by matter. But the fact is a fact for all that. It is a fact in everybody's consciousness that he thinks of himself as the body. We will not attempt to explain why I am in this body.

The Human
Soul.

Well, then, the human soul is eternal and immortal, perfect and infinite, and death means only a change of center from one body to another. The present is determined by our past actions, and the future will be by the present. The soul will go on evolving up or reverting back from birth to birth and death to death—like a tiny boat in a tempest, raised one moment on the foaming crest of a billow and dashed down into a yawning chasm the next, rolling to and fro at the mercy

of good and bad actions—a powerless, helpless wreck in an ever raging, ever rushing, uncompromising current of cause and effect. A little moth placed under the wheel of causation which rolls on, crushing everything in its way and waits not for the widow's tears or the orphan's cry.

The heart sinks at the idea, yet this is the law of nature. Is there no hope? Is there no escape? The cry that went up from the bottom of the heart of despair reached the throne of mercy, and words of hope and consolation came down and inspired a Vedic sage and he stood up before the world and in trumpet voice proclaimed the glad tidings to the world, "Hear, ye children of immortal bliss, even ye that resisted in higher spheres. I have found the ancient one, who is beyond all darkness, all delusion, and knowing Him alone you shall be saved from death again." "Children of immortal bliss," what a sweet, what a hopeful name. Allow me to call you, brethren, by that sweet name, heirs of immortal bliss; yea, the Hindu refuses to call you sinners.

The Law of Nature.

Ye are the children of God. The sharers of immortal bliss, holy and perfect beings. Ye divinities on earth, sinners? It is a sin to call a man so. It is a standing libel on human nature. Come up, live and shake off the delusion that you are sheep—you are souls immortal, spirits free and blest and eternal; ye are not matter, ye are not bodies. Matter is your servant, not you the servant of matter.

Thus it is the Vedas proclaim, not a dreadful combination of unforgiving laws, not an endless prison of cause and effect, but that, at the head of all these laws, in and through every particle of matter and force, stands One "through whose command the wind blows, the fire burns, the clouds rain, and death stalks upon the earth." And what is His nature?

He is everywhere, the pure and formless One, the Almighty and the All-merciful. "Thou art our Father, Thou art our Mother, Thou art our beloved Friend, Thou art the source of all strength. Thou art He that bearest the burdens of the universe; help me to bear the little burden of this life." Thus sang the Rishis of the Veda. And how to worship Him? Through love. "He is to be worshiped as the One beloved, dearer than everything in this and the next life."

This is the doctrine of love preached in the Vedas, and let us see how it is fully developed and preached by Krishna, whom the Hindus believe to have been God incarnate on earth.

He taught that a man ought to live in this world like a lotus leaf, which grows in water, but is never moistened by water; so a man ought to live in this world, his heart for God and his hands for work.

It is good to love God for hope of reward in this or the next world, but it is better to love God for love's sake, and the prayer goes, "Lord, I do not want wealth, nor children, nor learning. If it be Thy will I will go to a hundred hells, but grant me this, that I may love Thee without the hope of reward—unselfishly love for love's sake." One of the disciples of Krishna, the then emperor of India, was driven from his throne by his enemies and had to take shelter in a forest in the

Himalayas with his queen, and there one day the queen was asking him how it was that he, the most virtuous of men, should suffer so much misery, and Yuchistera answered, "Behold, my queen, the Himalayas, how grand and beautiful they are! I love them. They do not give me anything, but my nature is to love the grand, the beautiful; therefore, I love them. Similarly, I love the Lord. He is the source of all beauty, of all sublimity. He is the only object to be loved. My nature is to love Him, and therefore I love. I do not pray for anything. I do not ask for anything. Let Him place me wherever He likes. I must love Him for love's sake. I cannot trade in love."

The Vedas teach that the soul is divine, only held under bondage of matter, and perfection will be reached when the bond shall burst, and the word they use is, therefore, *Mukto*—freedom—freedom from the bonds of imperfection; freedom from death and misery.

Purity the
Condition of
Mercy

And they teach that this bondage can only fall off through the mercy of God, and this mercy comes to the pure. So purity is the condition of His mercy. How that mercy acts! He reveals Himself to the pure heart, and the pure and stainless man sees God; yea, even in this life, and then, and then only. All the crookedness of the heart is made straight. Then all doubt ceases. Man is no more the freak of a terrible law of causation. So this is the very center, the very vital conception of Hinduism. The Hindu does not want to live upon words and theories; if there are existences beyond the ordinary sensual existence, he wants to come face to face with them. If there is a soul in him which is not matter, if there is an all-merciful universal soul, he will go to Him direct. He must see Him, and that alone can destroy all doubts. So the best proof a Hindu sage gives about the soul, about God, is, "I have seen the soul, I have seen God."

And that is the only condition of perfection. The Hindu religion does not consist in struggles and attempts to believe a certain doctrine or dogma, but in realizing; not in believing, but in being and becoming.

So the whole struggle in their system is a constant struggle to become perfect, to become divine, to reach God and see God, and in this reaching God, seeing God, becoming perfect, even as the Father in heaven is perfect, consists the religion of the Hindus.

And what becomes of man when he becomes perfect? He lives a life of bliss, infinite. He enjoys infinite and perfect bliss, having obtained the only thing in which man ought to have pleasure—God—and enjoys the bliss with God.

So far all the Hindus are agreed. This is the common religion of all the sects of India, but then the question comes—perfection is absolute, and the absolute cannot be two or three. It cannot have any qualities. It cannot be an individual. And so when a soul becomes perfect and absolute, it must become one with the Brahman, and he would only realize the Lord as the perfection, the reality of his own nature and existence—existence absolute; knowledge absolute, and life absolute. We have often and often read about this being called the losing of individuality as in becoming a stock or a stone. "He jests at scars that never felt a wound."

I tell you it is nothing of the kind. If it is happiness to enjoy the consciousness of this small body, it must be more happiness to enjoy the consciousness of two bodies, or three, four, five; and the ultimate of happiness would be reached when it would become a universal consciousness.

Therefore, to gain this infinite, universal individuality, this miserable little individuality must go. Then alone can death cease, when I am one with life. Then alone can misery cease, when I am with happiness itself. Then alone can all errors cease, when I am one with knowledge itself. And this is the necessary scientific conclusion. Science has proved to me that physical individuality is a delusion, that really my body is one little, continuously changing body in an unbroken ocean of matter, and the Adwaitam is the necessary conclusion with my other counterpart, mind

Individuality
Must Go.

Science is nothing but the finding of unity, and as soon as any science can reach the perfect unity it will stop from further progress, because it will then have reached the goal. Thus, chemistry cannot progress further, when it shall have discovered one element out of which all others could be made. Physics will stop when it shall be able to discover one energy of which all others are but manifestations. The science of religion will become perfect when it discovers Him who is the one life in a universe of death, who is the constant basis of an ever-changing world, who is the only soul of which all souls are but manifestations. Thus, through multiplicity and duality the ultimate unity is reached, and religion can go no further. This is the goal of all—again and again, science after science, again and again.

And all science is bound to come to this conclusion in the long run. Manifestation and not creation is the word of science of today, and the Hindu is only glad that what he has cherished in his bosom for ages is going to be taught in more forcible language and with further light by the latest conclusions of science.

Descend we now from the aspirations of philosophy to the religion of the ignorant. At the very outset, I may tell you that there is no polytheism in India. In every temple, if one stands by and listens, he will find the worshipers apply all the attributes of God, including omnipresence, to these images. It is not polytheism. "The rose called by any other name would smell as sweet." Names are not explanations.

Religion of
the Ignorant.

I remember, when a boy, a Christian man was preaching to a crowd in India. Among other sweet things, he was asking the people, if he gave a blow to their idol with his stick, what could it do?" One of his hearers sharply answered: "If I abuse your God what can He do?" "You would be punished," said the preacher, "when you die." "So my idol will punish you when you die," said the villager.

The tree is known by its fruits, and when I have been amongst them that are called idolatrous men, the like of whose morality and spirituality and love I have never seen anywhere, I stop and ask myself, "Can sin beget holiness?"

Superstition
and Bigotry.

Superstition is the enemy of man, but bigotry is worse. Why does a Christian go to church? Why is the cross holy? Why is the face turned toward the sky in prayer? Why are there so many images in the Catholic church? Why are there so many images in the minds of Protestants when they pray? My brethren, we can no more think about anything without a material image than we can live without breathing. And by the law of association the material image calls the mental idea up and vice versa. Omnipresence, to almost the whole world, means nothing. Has God superficial area? If not, when we repeat the word we think of the extended earth, that is all.


Images and
Form.

As we find that somehow or other, by the laws of our constitution, we have got to associate our ideas of infinity with the image of a blue sky, or a sea, some cover the idea of holiness with an image of a church, or a mosque, or a cross. The Hindus have associated the ideas of holiness, purity, truth, omnipresence, and all other ideas with different images and forms. But with this difference: Some devote their whole lives to their idol of a church and never rise higher, because with them religion means an intellectual assent to certain doctrines and doing good to their fellows. The whole religion of the Hindu is centered in realization. Man is to become divine, realizing the divine, and, therefore, idol, or temple, or church, or books, are only the supports, the helps, of his spiritual childhood; but on and on man must progress.

He must not stop anywhere. "External worship, material worship," says the Vedas, "is the lowest stage, struggling to rise high; mental prayer is the next stage, but the highest stage is when the Lord has been realized." Mark the same earnest man who was kneeling before the idol tell you, "Him the sun cannot express, nor the moon nor the stars, the lightning cannot express him, nor the fire; through Him they all shine." He does not abuse the image or call it sinful. He recognizes in it a necessary stage of His life. "The child is father of the man." Would it be right for the old man to say that childhood is a sin or youth a sin? Nor is it compulsory in Hinduism.

If a man can realize his divine nature with the help of an image, would it be right to call it a sin? Nor, even when he has passed that stage, should he call it an error? To the Hindu, man is not traveling from error to truth, but from truth to truth, from lower to higher truth. To him all the religions, from the lowest fetichism to the highest absolutism, mean so many attempts of the human soul to grasp and realize the infinite, each determined by the conditions of its birth and association, and each of these mark a stage of progress, and every soul is a young eagle soaring higher and higher, gathering more and more strength till it reaches the glorious sun.

Unity and variety is the plan of nature, and the Hindu has recognized it. Every other religion lays down certain fixed dogmas, and tries to force society to adopt them. They lay down before society one coat which must fit Jack and Job and Henry, all alike. If it does not fit John or Henry he must go without a coat to cover his body.



The Hindus have discovered that the absolute can only be realized or thought of or stated through the relative, and the images, cross or crescent, are simply so many centers, so many pegs to hang the spiritual ideas on. It is not that this help is necessary for every one, but for many, and those that do not need it have no right to say that it is wrong.

One thing I must tell you. Idolatry in India does not mean anything horrible. It is not the mother of harlots. On the other hand, it is the attempt of undeveloped minds to grasp high spiritual truths. The Hindus have their faults; but mark this, they are always toward punishing their own bodies and never toward cutting the throats of their neighbors. If the Hindu fanatic burns himself on the pyre, he never lights the fire of inquisition. And even this cannot be laid at the door of religion any more than the burning of witches can be laid at the door of Christianity.

To the Hindu, then, the whole world of religion is only a traveling, a coming up, of different men and women, through various conditions and circumstances, to the same goal. Every religion is only an evolution out of the material man, a God—and the same God is the inspirer of all of them. Why, then, are there so many contradictions? They are only apparent, says the Hindu. The contradictions come from the same truth adapting itself to the different circumstances of different natures.

Contradictions only Apparent.

It is the same light coming through different colors. And these little variations are necessary for that adaptation. But in the heart of everything the same truth reigns. The Lord has declared to the Hindu in His incarnation as Krishna, "I am in every region as the thread through a string of pearls. And wherever thou seest extraordinary holiness and extraordinary power raising and purifying humanity, know ye, that I am there." And what was the result? Through the whole order of Sanskrit philosophy, I challenge anybody to find any such expression as that the Hindu only would be saved, not others. Says Vyas, "We find perfect men even beyond the pale of our caste and creed." How, then, can the Hindu, whose whole idea centers in God, believe in the Buddhism which is agnostic, or the Jainism which is atheist?

The whole force of Hindu religion is directed to the great central truth in every religion, to evolve a God out of man. They have not seen the Father, but they have seen the Son. And he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father.

This, brethren, is a short sketch of the ideas of the Hindus. The Hindu might have failed to carry out all his plans. But if there is ever to be a universal religion, it must be one which will hold no location in place or time; which will be infinite, like the God it will preach; whose Son shines upon the followers of Krishna or Christ, saints or sinners, alike; which will not be the Brahman or Buddhist, Christian or Mohammedan, but the sum total of all these, and still have infinite space for development; which in its Catholicity will embrace in its

Requirements of a Universal Religion.

infinite arms and find a place for every human being, from the lowest groveling man, from the brute, to the highest mind towering almost above humanity and making society stand in awe and doubt His human nature.

It will be a religion which will have no place for persecution or intolerance in its polity, which will recognize a divinity in every man or woman, and whose whole scope, whose whole force, will be centered in aiding humanity to realize its divine nature.

Aseka's council was a council of the Buddhist faith. Akbar's, though more to the purpose, was only a parlor meeting. It was reserved for America to proclaim to all quarters of the globe that the Lord is in every religion.

May He who is the Brahma of the Hindus, the Ahura Mazda of the Zoroastrians, the Buddha of the Buddhists, the Jehovah of the Jews, the Father in heaven of the Christians, give strength to you to carry out your noble idea.

Hail, Colum-
bia.

The star arose in the east; it traveled steadily toward the west, sometimes dimmed and sometimes effulgent, till it made a circuit of the world, and now it is again rising on the very horizon of the east, the borders of the Tasifu, a thousand fold more effulgent than it ever was before. Hail, Columbia, motherland of liberty! It has been given to thee, who never dipped hand in neighbor's blood, who never found out that shortest way of becoming rich by robbing one's neighbors—it has been given to thee to march on in the vanguard of civilization with the flag of harmony.

The World's Debt to Buddha.

Paper by H. DHARMAPALA, of India.



IF I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of them which well deserve the attention of those who have studied Plato and Kant, I should point to India. If I were to ask myself from what literature we here in Europe may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, and in fact more truly human a life, not for this life only, but for a transfigured and eternal life, again I should point to India.

Ancient India twenty-five centuries ago was the scene of a religious revolution the greatest the world has ever seen. Indian society at that time had two large and distinguished religious foundations—the Szmanas and the Brahmanas. Famous teachers arose and, with their disciples, went among the people preaching and converting them to their respective views. Chief of them were Purana Kassapa, Makkhali, Ghosala, Ajita Kesahambala, Pakudha Kaccagara, Sanjaya Belattiputta and Niganta Nathaputta. Amidst the galaxy of these bright luminaries there appeared other thinkers and philosophers who, though they abstained from a higher claim of religious reformers, yet appeared as scholars of independent thought. Such were Bavari, Pissa Metteyya, Mettagua, Dunnaka, Dkotaka, Upasiva, Henaka, Todeyya, Sela Parukkha, Pokkharadsati, Maggadessakes, Maggajivins. These were all noted for their learning in their sacred Scriptures, in grammar, history, philosophy, etc.

The air was full of a coming spiritual struggle. Hundreds of the most scholarly young men of noble families (Eulaputta) were leaving their homes in quest of truth; ascetics were undergoing the severest mortifications to discover the panacea for the evils of suffering. Young dialecticians were wandering from place to place engaged in disputations, some advocating skepticism as the best weapon to fight against

**Religious
Revolution.**

the realistic doctrines of the day, some a sort of life which was the nearest way to getting rid of existence, some denying a future life. It was a time deep and many sided in intellectual movements.

When Buddha
Appeared.

The sacrificial priest was powerful then as he is now. He was the mediator between God and man. Monotheism of the most crude type, fetichism from anthropomorphic deism to transcendental dualism was rampant. So was materialism from sensual epicureanism to transcendental nihilism. In the words of Dr. Oldenberg: "When the dialectic skepticism began to attach moral ideas, when a painful longing for deliverance from the burden of being was met by the first signs of moral decay, Buddha appeared."

"The Saviour of the world,
Prince Siddhartha styled on earth.
In earth on heavens and hells incomparable.
All honored, wisest, best, most pitiful,
The teacher of Nirvana and the law."

Oriental scholars, who had begun their researches in the domain of Indian literature at the beginning of this century, were put to great perplexity of thought at the discovery of the existence of a religion called after Buddha in the Indian philosophical books. Sir William Jones, H. H. Wilson and Mr. Colbrooke were embarrassed in being unable to identify him. Dr. Marshman, in 1824, said that Buddha was the Egyptian Apis, and Sir William Jones solved the problem by saying that he was no other than the Scandinavian Woden. The barge of the early orientals was drifting into the sand banks of Sanskrit literature, when in June, 1837, the whole of the obscure history of India and Buddhism was made clear by the deciphering of the rock-cut edicts of Asoka the Great in Garnar, and Kapur-da-gini by that lamented archæologist, James Pramsep, by the translation of the Pali Ceylon history into English by Turner, and by the discovery of Buddhist manuscripts in the temples of Mepal Ceylon and other Buddhist countries. In 1844 the first rational scientific and comprehensive account of the Buddhist religion was published by the eminent scholar, Eugene Purnouf. The key to the archives of this great religion was also presented to the thoughtful people of Europe by this great scholar.

With due gratitude I mention the names of the scholars to whose labors the present increasing popularity of the Buddha religion is due: Spence, Hardy, Gogerly, Turner, Professor Childers, Dr. Davids, Dr. Oldenberg, Max Müller, Professor Jansboll and others. Pali scholarship began with the labors of the late Dr. Childers, and the western world is indebted to Dr. Davids, who is indefatigable in his labors in bringing the rich stores of hidden wisdom from the minds of Pali literature. To two agencies the present popularity of Buddhism is due: Sir Edwin Arnold's incomparable epic, "The Light of Asia," and the theosophical society.

"The irresistible charm which influences the thinking world to study Buddhism, is the unparalleled life of its glorified founder. His

teaching has found favor with every one who has studied his history. His doctrines are the embodiment of universal love. Not only our philologists, but even those who are prepossessed against his faith, have ever found but words of praise," says H. G. Blavatsky. "Nothing can be higher and purer than his social and moral code." "That moral code," says Max Müller, "taken by itself is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known." "The more I learn to know Buddha," says Professor Jansboll, "the more I admire him." "We must," says Professor Barth, "set clearly before us the admirable figure which detaches itself from it, that finished model of calm and sweet majesty, of infinite tenderness for all that breathes, and compassion for all that suffers, of perfect moral freedom and exemption from every prejudice. It was to save others that he who was one day to be Gautama disdained to tread sooner in the way of Nirvana, and that he chose to become Buddha at the cost of countless numbers of supplementary existences."

His Social and
Moral Code.

"The singular force," says Professor Bloomfield, "of the great teacher's personality is unquestioned. The sweetness of his character and the majesty of his personality stand forth upon the background of India's religious history with a degree of vividness which is strongly enhanced by the absence of other religions of any great importance." And even Bartholomey St. Hilaire, misjudging Buddhism as he does, says: "I do not hesitate to say that there is not among the founders of religions a figure either more pure or more touching than that of Buddha. He is the perfect model of all the virtues he preaches; his self-abnegation, his charity, his unalterable sweetness of disposition do not fail him for one instant." That poet of Buddhism, the sweet singer of the "Light of Asia," Sir Edwin Arnold, thus estimates the place of Buddhism and Buddha in history: "In point of age most other creeds are youthful compared with this venerable religion, which has in it the eternity of a universal hope, the immortality of a boundless love, an indestructible element of faith in the final good and the proudest assertion ever made of human freedom."

"Infinite is the wisdom of the Buddha. Boundless is the love of Buddha to all that live." So say the Buddhist scriptures. Buddha is called the Mahamah Karumika, which means the all merciful Lord who has compassion on all that live. To the human mind Buddha's wisdom and mercy is incomprehensible. The foremost and greatest of his disciples, the blessed Sariputta, even he has acknowledged that he could not gauge the Buddha's wisdom and mercy.

Boundless Love

Already the thinking minds of Europe and America have offered their tribute of admiration to his divine memory. Professor Huxley says: "Gautama got rid of even that shade of a shadow of permanent existence by a metaphysical tour de force of great interest to the student of philosophy, seeing that it supplies the wanting half of Bishop Berkeley's well-known idealist argument. It is a remarkable indication of the subtlety of Indian speculation that Gautama should have seen deeper than the greatest of modern idealists."

History Re-
peating Itself.

The tendency of enlightened thought of the day, all the world over, is not toward theology, but philosophy and psychology. The bark of theological dualism is drifting into danger. The fundamental principles of evolution and monism are being accepted by the thoughtful. The crude conceptions of anthropomorphic deism are being relegated into the limbo of oblivion. Lip service of prayer is giving place to a life of altruism. Personal self-sacrifice is gaining the place of a vicarious sacrifice. History is repeating itself. Twenty-five centuries ago India witnessed an intellectual and religious revolution which culminated in the overthrow of monotheism and priestly selfishness, and the establishment of a synthetic religion. This was accomplished through Sakya Muni. Today the Christian world is going through the same process.

It is difficult to properly comprehend the system of Buddha by a spiritual study of its doctrines. And especially by those who have been trained to think that there is no truth in other religions. When the scholar Vachcha, approaching Buddha, demanded a complete elucidation of his doctrines, he said: "This doctrine is hard to see, hard to understand, solemn and sublime, not resting on dialectic, subtle, and perceived only by the wise. It is hard for you to learn who are of different views, different ideas of fitness, different choice, trained and taught in another school."

Conflicting
Opinions.

A systematic study of Buddha's doctrine has not yet been made by the western scholars, hence the conflicting opinions expressed by them at various times. The notion once held by the scholars that it is a system of materialism has been exploded. The positivists of France found it a positivism. Buckner and his school of materialists thought it was a materialistic system. Agnostics found in Buddha an agnostic, and Dr Rhys Davids, the eminent Pali scholar, used to call him the "agnostic philosopher of India." Some scholars have found an expressed monotheism therein. Arthur Lillie, another student of Buddhism, thinks it a theistic system. Pessimists identify it with Schopenhauer's pessimism. The late Mr. Buckle identified it with the pantheism of India. Some have found in it a monoism, and the latest dictum is Professor Huxley's, that it is an idealism supplying "the wanting half of Bishop Buckley's well-known idealist argument." Dr. Eikl says that "Buddhism is a system of vast magnitude, for it embraces all the various branches of science, which our western nations have been long accustomed to divide for separate study. It embodies, in one living structure, grand and peculiar views of physical science, refined and subtle theories on abstract metaphysics, an edifice of fanciful mysticism, a most elaborate and far reaching system of practical morality, and, finally, a church organization as broad in its principles and as finely wrought in its most intricate network as any in the world. All this is, moreover, confined in such a manner that the essence and substance of the whole may be compressed into a few formulas and symbols plain and suggestive enough to be grasped by the most simple-minded ascetic, and yet so full of philosophic depths

as to provide rich food for years of meditation to the metaphysician, the poet, the mystic, and pleasant pasturage for the most fiery imagination of any poetical dreamer."

In the religion of Buddha is found a comprehensive system of ethics, and a transcendental metaphysic embracing a sublime psychology. To the simple minded it offers a code of morality, to the earnest student a system of pure thought. But the basic doctrine is the self-purification of man.

A Sublime
Psychology.

Spiritual progress is impossible for him who does not lead a life of purity and compassion. The superstructure has to be built on the basis of a pure life. So long as one is fettered by selfishness, passion, prejudice, fear, so long the doors of his higher nature are closed against the truth. The rays of the sunlight of truth enter the mind of him who is fearless to examine truth, who is free from prejudice, who is not tied by the sensual passion, and who has reasoning faculties to think. One has to be an atheist in the sense employed by Max Müller:

"There is an atheism which is not death; there is another which is the very life blood of all true faith. It is the power of giving up what, in our best, our most honest movements, we know to be no longer true. It is the readiness to replace the less perfect, however dear, however sacred it may have been to us, by the more perfect, however much it may be detested as yet by the world. It is the true self-surrender, the true self-sacrifice, the truest trust in truth, the truest faith."

Without that atheism no new religion, no reform, no reformation, no resuscitation would ever have been possible; without that atheism no new life is possible for any one of us. The strongest emphasis has been put by Buddha on the supreme importance of having an unprejudiced mind before we start on the road of investigation of truth. The least attachment of the mind to preconceived ideas is a positive hindrance to the acceptance of truth. Prejudice, passion, fear of expression of one's convictions and ignorance are the four biases that have to be sacrificed at the threshold. To be born as a human being is a glorious privilege. Man's dignity consists in his capability to reason and think and to live up to the highest ideal of pure life, of calm thought, of wisdom, without extraneous interventions. Buddha says that man can enjoy in this life a glorious existence, a life of individual freedom, of fearlessness and compassionateness. This dignified ideal of manhood may be attained by the humblest, and this consummation raises him above wealth and royalty. "He that is compassionate and observes the law is My disciple."

Dignified
Ideal of Man-
hood.

Human brotherhood forms the fundamental teaching of Buddha—universal love and sympathy with all mankind and with animal life. Every one is enjoined to love all beings as a mother loves her only child and takes care of it even at the risk of her life. The realization of the ideal of brotherhood is obtained when the first stage of holiness is realized. The idea of separation is destroyed and the oneness of life is recognized. There is no pessimism in the teachings of Buddha, for he strictly enjoins on his holy disciples not even to sug-

gest to others that life is not worth living. On the contrary, the usefulness of life is emphasized for the sake of doing good to self and humanity.

From the fetich worshipping savage to the highest type of humanity man naturally yearns for something higher. And it is for this reason that Buddha inculcated the necessity for self-reliance and independent thought. To guide humanity in the right path, a Tathagata (Messiah) appears from time to time.

Teachings on
Evolution.


In the sense of a supreme Creator, Buddha says that there is no such being, accepting the doctrine of evolution as the only true one, with corollary, the law of cause and effect. He condemns the idea of a Creator, but the supreme God of the Brahmans and minor gods are accepted. But they are subject to the law of cause and effect. This supreme God is all love, all merciful, all gentle, and looks upon all beings with equanimity. Buddha teaches men to practice these four supreme virtues. But there is no difference between the perfect man and this supreme God of the present world.

The teachings of the Buddha on evolution are clear and expansive. We are asked to look upon the cosmos "as a continuous process unfolding itself in regular order in obedience to natural laws. We see in it all not a yawning chaos restrained by the constant interference from without of a wise and beneficent external power, but a vast aggregate of original elements perpetually working out their own fresh redistribution in accordance with their own inherent energies. He regards the cosmos as an almost infinite collection of material, animated by an almost infinite sum total of energy," which is called Akasa. I have used the above definition of evolution, as given by Grant Allen in his "Life of Darwin," as it beautifully expresses the generalized idea of Buddhism. We do not postulate that man's evolution began from the protoplasmic stage, but we are asked not to speculate on the origin of life, on the origin of the law of cause and effect, etc. So far as this great law is concerned we say that it controls the phenomena of human life as well as those of external nature, the whole knowable universe forms one undivided whole.

Buddha promulgated his system of philosophy after having studied all religions. And in the Brahma-jala sutta sixty-two creeds are discussed. In the Kalama, the sutta, Buddha says:

"Do not believe in what ye have heard. Do not believe in traditions, because they have been handed down for many generations. Do not believe in anything because it is renowned and spoken of by many. Do not believe merely because the written statement of some old sage is produced. Do not believe in conjectures. Do not believe in that as truth to which you have become attached by habit. Do not believe merely on the authority of your teachers and elders. Often observation and analysis, when the result agrees with reason, is conducive to the good and gain of one and all. Accept and live up to it."

To the ordinary householder, whose highest happiness consists in being wealthy here and in heaven hereafter, Buddha inculcated a sim-



Buddhist Priest, Siam.

ple code of morality. The student of Buddha's religion from destroying life, lays aside the club and weapon. He is modest and full of pity. He is compassionate to all creatures that have life. He abstains from theft, and he passes his life in honesty and purity of heart. He lives a life of chastity and purity. He abstains from falsehood and injures not his fellowman by deceit. Putting away slander he abstains from calumny. He is a peacemaker, a speaker of words that make for peace. Whatever word is humane, pleasant to the ear, lovely, reaching to the heart, such are the words he speaks. He abstains from harsh language. He abstains from foolish talk, he abstains from intoxicants and stupefying drugs.

Uprightness
his Object.

The advance student of the religion of Buddha, when he has faith in him, thinks "full of hindrances in household life is a path defiled by passion. Pure as the air is the life of him who has renounced all worldly things. How difficult it is for the man who dwells at home to live the higher life in all its fullness, in all its purity, in all its freedom. Let me then cut off my hair and beard, let me clothe myself in orange-colored robes, let me go forth from a household life into the homeless state." Then before long, forsaking his portion of wealth, forsaking his circle of relatives, he cuts off his hair and beard, he clothes himself in the orange-colored robes and he goes into the homeless state, and then he passes a life of self-restraint, according to the rules of the order of the blessed one. Uprightness is his object and he sees danger in the least of those things he should avoid. He encompasses himself with holiness, in word and deed. He sustains his life by means that are quite pure. Good is his conduct, guarded the door of his senses, mindful and self-possessed, he is altogether happy.

The student of pure religion abstains from earning a livelihood by the practice of low and lying arts, viz., all divination, interpretation of dreams, palmistry, astrology, crystal prophesying, charms of all sorts. Buddha also says:

"Just as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard in all the four directions without difficulty, even so of all things that have life, there is not one that the student passes by or leaves aside, but regards them all with mind set free and deep-felt pity, sympathy and equanimity. He lets his mind pervade the whole world with thoughts of love."

To realize the unseen is the goal of the student of Buddha's teachings, and such a one has to lead an absolutely pure life. Buddha says:

"Let him fulfill all righteousness, let him be devoted to that quietude of heart which springs from within, let him not drive back the ecstasy of contemplation, let him look through things, let him be much alone. Fulfill all righteousness for the sake of the living, and for the sake of the blessed ones that are dead and gone."

Thought transference, thought reading, clairvoyance, projection the sub-conscious self, and all the higher branches of psychical science that just now engage the thoughtful attention of psychical researchers



are within the reach of him who fulfills all righteousness, who is devoted to solitude and to contemplation.

Charity, observance of moral rules, purifying the mind, making others participate in the good work that one is doing, co-operating with others in doing good, nursing the sick, giving gifts to the deserving ones, hearing all that is good and beautiful, making others learn the rules of morality, accepting the laws of cause and effect are the common appanage of all good men.

Prohibited employments include slave dealing, sale of weapons of warfare, sale of poisons, sale of intoxicants, sale of flesh— all deemed the lowest of professions.

The five kinds of wealth are: Faith, pure life, receptivity of the mind to all that is good and beautiful, liberality and wisdom. Those who possess these five kinds of wealth in their past incarnations are influenced by the teachings of Buddha.

Besides these, Buddha says in his universal precepts: "He who is faithful, and leads the life of a householder, and possesses the following four (Dhammas) virtues, truth, justice, firmness and liberality—such a one does not grieve when passing away. Pray ask other teachers and philosophers far and wide, whether there is found anything greater than truth, self-restraint, liberality and forbearance."

Universal Precepts.

The pupil should minister to his teacher; he should rise up in his presence, wait upon him, listen to all that he says with respectful attention, perform the duties necessary for his personal comfort, and carefully attend to his instruction. The teacher should show affection for his pupil. He trains him in virtue and good manners, carefully instructs him, imparts to him a knowledge of the sciences and wisdom of the ancients, speaks well of him to relatives and guards him from danger.

The honorable man ministers to his friends and relatives by presenting gifts, by courteous language, by promoting as his equals and by sharing with them his prosperity. They should watch over him when he has negligently exposed himself, guard his property when he is careless, assist him in difficulties, stand by him and help to provide for his family.

The master should minister to the wants of his servants, as dependents; he assigns them labor suitable to their strength, provides for their comfortable support; he attends them in sickness, causes them to partake of any extraordinary delicacy he may obtain and makes them occasional presents. The servants should manifest their attachment to the master; they rise before him in the morning and retire later to rest; they do not purloin his property, do their work cheerfully and actively and are respectful in their behavior toward him.

The religious teachers should manifest their kind feelings toward lawyers. They should dissuade them from vice, excite them to virtuous acts—being desirous of promoting the welfare of all. They should instruct them in the things they had not previously learned, confirm them in the truths and point out to them the way to heaven. The

lawyers should minister to the teachers by respectful attention manifested in their words, actions and thoughts, and by supplying them their temporal wants and by allowing them constant access to them.

The wise, virtuous, prudent, intelligent, teachable, docile man will become eminent. The persevering, diligent man, unshaken in adversity and of inflexible determination will become eminent. The well-informed, friendly-disposed, prudent-speaking, generous-minded, self-controlled, self-possessed man will become eminent.

In this world generosity, mildness of speech, public spirit and courteous behavior are worthy of respect under all circumstances and will be valuable in all places. If these be not possessed the mother will receive neither honor nor support from the son, neither will the father receive respect nor honor. Buddha also says:

A Tathagata
Born into the
World.

"Know that from time to time a Tathagata is born into the world, fully enlightened, blessed and worthy, abounding in wisdom and goodness, happy with knowledge of the world, unsurpassed as a guide to erring mortal, a teacher of gods and men, a blessed Buddha. He, by himself, thoroughly understands and sees, as it were face to face, this universe, the world below with all its spirits and the worlds above, and all creatures, all religious teachers, gods and men, and he then makes his knowledge known to others. The truth doth he proclaim, both in its letter and its spirit, lovely in its origin, lovely in its progress, lovely in its consummation; the higher life doth he proclaim in all its purity and in all its perfectness.

First. He is absolutely free from all passions, commits no evil even in secrecy and is the embodiment of perfection. He is above doing anything wrong.

Second. Self-introspection—by this has he reached the state of supreme enlightenment.

Third. By means of his divine eye he looks back to the remotest past and future. Knows the way of emancipation, and is accomplished in the three great branches of divine knowledge, and has gained perfect wisdom. He is in possession of all psychic powers, always willing to listen, full of energy, wisdom and dhyana.

Fourth. He has realized eternal peace and walks in the perfect path of virtue.

Fifth. He knows three states of existence.

Sixth. He is incomparable in purity and holiness.

Seventh. He is teacher of gods and men.

Eighth. He exhorts gods and men at the proper time, according to their individual temperaments.

Ninth. He is the supremely enlightened teacher and the perfect embodiment of all the virtues he teaches. The two characteristics of Buddha are wisdom and compassion."

Buddha also gave a warning to his followers when he said:

A Warning.

"He who is not generous, who is fond of sensuality, who is disturbed at heart, who is of uneven mind, who is not reflective, who is not of calm mind, who is discontented at heart, who has no control over his senses—such a disciple is far from me, though he is in body near me."

The attainment of salvation is by the perception of self through charity, purity, self-sacrifice, self-knowledge, dauntless energy, patience, truth, resolution, love and equanimity. The last words of Buddha were these:

Attainment
of Salvation.

"Be ye lamps unto yourselves; be ye a refuge to yourselves; betake yourself to an eternal voyage; hold fast to the truth as a lamp; hold fast as a refuge to the truth; look not for refuge to any one besides yourselves. Learn ye, then, that knowledge which I have attained and have declared unto you and walk ye in it, practice and increase in order that the path of holiness may last and long endure for the blessing of many people, to the relief of the world, to the welfare, the blessing, the joy of gods and men."



The Law of Cause and Effect, as Taught by Buddha.

Paper by SHAKU SOYEN, of Japan.



If we open our eyes and look at the universe we observe the sun and moon and the stars on the sky; mountains, rivers, plants, animals, fishes and birds on the earth. Cold and warmth come alternately; shine and rain change from time to time without ever reaching an end. Again let us close our eyes and calmly reflect upon ourselves. From morning to evening we are agitated by the feelings of pleasure and pain, love and hate; sometimes full of ambition and desire, sometimes called to the utmost excitement of reason and will. Thus the action of mind is like an endless issue of a spring of water. As the phenomena of the external world are various and marvelous, so is the internal attitude of human mind. Shall we ask for the explanation of these marvelous phenomena? Why is the universe in a constant flux? Why do things change? Why is the mind subjected to a constant agitation? For these Buddhism offers only one explanation, namely, the law of cause and effect.

Now let us proceed to understand the nature of this law, as taught by Buddha himself:

First. The complex nature of cause.

Second. An endless progression of the causal law.

Third. The causal law in terms of the three worlds.

Fourth. Self-formation of cause and effect.

Fifth. Cause and effect as the law of nature.

Nature of
Cause.

First. The complex nature of cause. A certain phenomenon cannot arise from a single cause, but it must have several conditions; in other words, no effect can arise unless several causes combine together. Take for example a case of fire. You may say its cause is oil or fuel; but neither oil nor fuel alone can give rise to a flame. Atmosphere,

space and several other conditions, physical or mechanical, are necessary for the rise of a flame. All these necessary conditions combined together can be called the cause of a flame. This is only an example for the explanation of the complex nature of cause, but the rest may be inferred.

Second. An endless progression of the causal law. A cause must be preceded by another cause, and an effect must be followed by another effect. Thus, if we investigate the cause of a cause, the past of a past, by tracing back even to an eternity, we shall never reach the first cause. The assertion that there is the first cause is contrary to the fundamental principle of nature, since a certain cause must have an origin in some preceding cause or causes, and there is no cause which is not an effect. From the assumption that a cause is an effect of a preceding cause, which is also preceded by another, thus, *ad infinitum*, we infer that there is no beginning in the universe. As there is no effect which is not a cause, so there is no cause which is not an effect. Buddhism considers the universe has no beginning, no end. Since, even if we trace back to an eternity, absolute cause cannot be found, so we come to the conclusion that there is no end in the universe. Like as the waters of rivers evaporate and form clouds, and the latter changes its form into rain, thus returning once more into the original form of waters, the causal law is in a logical circle changing from cause to effect, effect to cause.

Progression
of the Causal
Law.

Third. The causal law in terms of three worlds, namely, past, present and future. All the religions apply more or less the causal law in the sphere of human conduct, and remark that the pleasure and happiness of one's future life depend upon the purity of his present life. But what is peculiar to Buddhism is, it applies the law not only to the relation of present and future life, but also past and present. As the facial expressions of each individual are different from those of others, men are graded by the different degrees of wisdom, talent, wealth and birth. It is not education nor experience alone that can make a man wise, intelligent and wealthy, but it depends upon one's past life. What are the causes or conditions which produce such a difference? To explain it in a few words, I say, it owes its origin to the different quality of actions which we have done in our past life, namely, we are here enjoying or suffering the effect of what we have done in our past life. If you closely observe the conduct of your fellow beings, you will notice that each individual acts different from the others. From this we can infer that in future life each one will also enjoy or suffer the result of his own actions done in this existence. As the pleasure and pain of one's present actions, so the happiness or misery of our future world will be the result of our present action.

Past, Present
and Future.

Fourth. Self-formation of cause and effect. We enjoy happiness and suffer misery, our own actions being causes; in other words, there is no other cause than our own actions which make us happy or unhappy. Now let us observe the different attitudes of human life; one is happy and others feel unhappy. Indeed, even among the members

Self-formation
of Cause
and Effect.

of the same family, we often notice a great diversity in wealth and fortune. Thus various attitudes of human life can be explained by the self-formation of cause and effect. There is no one in the universe but one's self who rewards or punishes him. The diversity in future stages will be explained by the same doctrine. This is termed in Buddhism the "self-deed and self-gain," or "self-make and self-receive." Heaven and hell are self-made. God did not provide you with a hell, but you yourself. The glorious happiness of future life will be the effect of present virtuous actions.


The Law of
Nature.

Fifth. Cause and effect as the law of nature. According to the different sects of Buddhism, more or less, different views are entertained in regard to the law of causality, but so far they agree in regarding it as the law of nature, independent of the will of Buddha, and much less of the will of human beings. The law exists for an eternity, without beginning, without end. Things grow and decay, and this is caused, not by an external power, but by an internal force which is in things themselves as an innate attribute. This internal law acts in accordance with the law of cause and effect, and thus appear immense phenomena of the universe. Just as the clock moves by itself without any intervention of any external force, so is the progress of the universe.

We are born in the world of variety; some are poor and unfortunate, others are wealthy and happy. The state of variety will be repeated again and again in our future lives. But to whom shall we complain of our misery? To none but ourselves. We reward ourselves; so shall we do in our future life. If you ask me who determined the length of our life, I say, the law of causality. Who made him happy and made me miserable? The law of causality. Bodily health, material wealth, wonderful genius, unnatural suffering are the infallible expressions of the law of causality which governs every particle of the universe, every portion of human conduct. Would you ask me about the Buddhist morality? I reply, in Buddhism the source of moral authority is the causal law. Be kind, be just, be humane, be honest, if you desire to crown your future. Dishonesty, cruelty, inhumanity, will condemn you to a miserable fall.

First Discoverer of the Law.

As I have already explained to you, our sacred Buddha is not the creator of this law of nature, but he is the first discoverer of the law who led thus his followers to the height of moral perfection. Who shall utter a word against him? Who discovered the first truth of the universe? Who has saved and will save by his noble teachings the millions and millions of the falling human beings? Indeed, too much approbation could not be uttered to honor his sacred name.



Buddhist and Aztec Idols.

The Religion of the World.

Paper by ZENSHORI NOGUCHI, Interpreter for the Japanese Buddhist Priests.



TAKE much pleasure in addressing you, my brothers, on the occasion of the first world's religious congress, by your kind indulgence, with what comes to my mind today without any preliminary preparation, for I have been entirely occupied in interpreting for the four Hijiris who came with me to attend this congress.

As you remembered Columbus for his discovery, and as you brought to completion the wonderful enterprise of the world's fair, I also have to remember one whose knocks at the long-closed door of my country awakened us from our long and undisturbed slumber and led us to open our eyes to the condition of other civilized countries, including that in which I now am wondering at its greatness and beauty, especially as it is epitomized in the World's Fair. I refer to the famous Commodore Perry. I must do for him what Americans have done and do for Columbus. With him I have one, too, to remember, whose statue you have doubtless seen at the world's fair. His name was Naosuke ji, the Lord of Hikone and the great Chancellor of Bakufu. He was unfortunately assassinated by the hands of the conservative party, which proclaimed him a traitor because he opened the door to the stranger without waiting for the permission of his master the emperor.

Since we opened the door about thirty-six years have passed, during which time wonderful changes and progress have taken place in my country, so that now, in the midst of the White City and the World's Fair, I do not find myself wondering so much as a barbarian would do. Who made my country so civilized? He was the knocker, as I called him, Commodore Perry. So my people owe a great deal to him and to the America who gave him to us.

I must therefore make some return to him for his kindness, as you are doing in the World's Fair to Columbus for his discovery. Shall I offer to you, who represent him, Japanese teapots and teacups? No.

Bring his
Buddhist
Faith.

Then what is to be done? These things that we have just laid aside as inadequate are only materials, which fire and water can destroy. In their stead I bring something that the elements cannot destroy, and it is the best of all my possessions.

What is that? Buddhism! As you see, I am simply a layman, and do not belong to any sect of Buddhism at all. So I present to you four Buddhist sorios, who will give their addresses before you and place in your hands many thousand copies of English translations of Buddhist works, such as "Outlines of the Mahayana, as Taught by Buddha;" "A Brief Account of the Shin-shu;" "A Shin-shu Catechism," and "The Sutra of Forty-two Sections and Two Other Short Sutras," etc. Besides these 400 volumes of the complete Buddha Shaka's "Sutra" are imported for the first time to this country as a present to the chairman of this congress by the four Buddhist sorios. These three Chinese translations, which, of course, Japanese can read, are made from the original Sanskrit by many Chinese sorios in ancient times. I hope they will be translated into English, which can be understood by almost all the people of the world.

I regret to say that there is probably no Mahayana doctrine, which is the highest order of Buddhist teaching, translated into English. If you wish to know what the Mahayana doctrine is, you must learn to read Chinese or Japanese, as you are doing in the Chatauqua system of education, otherwise Chinese or Japanese must learn English enough to translate them for English reading people. Whichever way it be, we religionists must do this, for the sake of the world. I have devoted some years and am now devoting more years to learning English, for the purpose of doing this in my private capacity. But the work is too hard for me. For example, I have translated Rev Professor Tokunaga's work, without any help from foreigners, on account of the want of time. I am very sorry that I have not enough copies of that book to distribute them to you all, for I almost used them up in presents on my way to this city. Permit me to distribute the ten last copies that still remain in my trunk to those who happened to take the seats nearest me.

**Mahayana
Doctrine.**

How many religions and their sects are there in the world? Thousands. Is it to be hoped that the number of religions in the world will be increased by thousands more? No. Why? If such were our hope we ought to finally bring the number of religions to as great a figure as that of the population of the world, and the priests of the various religions should not be allowed to preach for the purpose of bringing the people into their respective sects. In that case they should rather say: "Don't believe whatever we preach; get away from the church and make your own sect as we do." Is it right for the priest to say so? No.

Then, is there a hope of decreasing the number of religions? Yes. How far? To one. Why? Because the truth is only one. Each sect or religion, as its ultimate object, aims to attain truth. Geometry teaches us that the shortest line between two points is lim-

Religion of
the World.

ited to only one; so we must find out that one way of attaining the truth among the thousands of ways to which the rival religions point us, and if we cannot find out that one way among the already established religions we must seek it in a new one. So long as we have thousands of religions the religion of the world has not yet attained its full development in all respects. If the thousands of religions do continue to develop and reach the state of full development there will be no more any distinction between them, or any difference between faith and reason, religion and science. This is the end at which we aim and to which we believe that we know the shortest way.

I greet you, ladies and gentlemen of the World's Parliament of Religions, the gathering together of which is an important step in that direction.



What Buddhism Teaches of Man's Relation to God, and Its Influence on Those Who Have Received It.

Paper by KINZA RIUGE HIRAI, of Japan.



HERE are very few countries in the world so misunderstood as Japan. Among the innumerable unfair judgments, the religious thought of my countrymen is especially misrepresented, and the whole nation is condemned as heathen. Be they heathen, pagan, or something else, it is a fact that from the beginning of our history Japan has received all teachings with open mind; and also that the instructions which came from outside have commingled with the native religion in entire harmony, as is seen by so many temples built in the name of truth with a mixed appellation of Buddhism and Shintoism; as is seen by the affinity among the teachers of Confucianism and Taoism, or other isms, and the Buddhists

and Shinto priests; as is seen by the individual Japanese, who pays his other respects to all teachings mentioned above; as is seen by the peculiar construction of the Japanese houses, which have generally two rooms, one for a miniature Buddhist temple and the other for a small Shinto shrine, before which the family study the respective scriptures of the two religions; as is seen by the popular ode,

Unfair Judgments of Japan

Wake noboru
Fumoto no michi oa
Ooke redo,
Ona ji takane no
Tsuki wo miru Kana,

which translated means: "Though there are many roads at the foot of the mountains, yet if the top is reached the same moon is seen," and

other similar odes and mottoes, which are put in the mouth of the ignorant country old woman, when she decides the case of bigoted religious contention among young girls. In reality Synthetic religion, or Entitism, is the Japanese specialty, and I will not hesitate to call it Japanism.

But you will protest and say: "Why, then, is Christianity not so warmly accepted by your nation as other religions?" This is the point which I wish especially to present before you. There are two causes why Christianity is not so cordially received. This great religion was widely spread in my country, but in 1637 the Christian missionaries, combined with the converts, caused a tragic and bloody rebellion against the country, and it is understood that those missionaries intended to subjugate Japan to their own mother country. This shocked all Japan, and it took the government of the Shogun a year to suppress this terrible and intrusive commotion. To those who accuse us that our mother country prohibited Christianity, not now, but in a past age, I will reply that it was not from religious or racial antipathy, but to prevent such another insurrection; and to protect our independence we were obliged to prohibit the promulgation of the Gospels.

If our history had had no such record of foreign devastation under the disguise of religion, and if our people had had no hereditary horror and prejudice against the name of Christianity, it might have been eagerly embraced by the whole nation. But this incident has passed and we may forget it. Yet it is not entirely unreasonable that the terrified suspicion, or you may say superstition, that Christianity is the instrument of depredation should have been avoidably or unavoidably aroused in the oriental mind, when it is an admitted fact that some of the powerful nations of Christendom are gradually encroaching upon the orient and when the following circumstance is daily impressed upon our minds, reviving a vivid memory of the past historical occurrence. The circumstances of which I am about to speak is the present experience of ourselves, to which I especially call the attention of this parliament, and not only this Parliament, but also the whole of Christendom.

Treaty of
1858.

Since 1853, when Commodore Perry came to Japan as the ambassador of the President of the United States of America, our country began to be better known by all western nations and the new ports were widely opened and the prohibition of the Gospels was abolished, as it was before the Christian rebellion. By the convention at Yeddo, now Tokio, in 1858, the treaty was stipulated between America and Japan, and also with the European powers. It was the time when our country was yet under the feudal government; and on account of our having been secluded for over two centuries since the Christian rebellion of 1637, diplomacy was quite a new experience to the feudal officers, who put their full confidence upon western nations, and, without any alteration, accepted every article of the treaty presented from the foreign governments. According to the treaty we are in a very disadvantageous situation; and amongst the others there are two prominent

articles, which deprive us of our rights and advantages. One is the extritoriality of western nations in Japan, by which all cases in regard to right, whether of property or person, arising between the subjects of the western nations in my country as well as between them and the Japanese, are subjected to the jurisdiction of the authorities of the western nations. Another regards the tariff, which, with the exception of five per cent ad valorem, we have no right to impose where it might properly be done.

It is also stipulated that either of the contracting parties to this treaty, on giving one year's previous notice to the other, may demand a revision thereof on or after the 1st of July, 1872. Therefore, in 1871, our government demanded a revision, and since then we have been constantly requesting it, but foreign governments have simply ignored our requests, making many excuses. One part of the treaty between the United States of America and Japan concerning the tariff was annulled, for which we thank with sincere gratitude the kind-hearted American nation; but I am sorry to say that, as no European power has followed in the wake of America, in this respect our tariff right remains in the same condition as it was before.

We have no judicial power over the foreigners in Japan, and as a natural consequence we are receiving injuries, legal and moral, the accounts of which are seen constantly in our native newspapers. As the western people live far from us they do not know the exact circumstances. Probably they hear now and then the reports from the missionaries and their friends in Japan. I do not deny that their reports are true; but if a person wants to obtain any unmistakable information in regard to his friend he ought to hear the opinions about him from many sides. If you closely examine with your unbiased mind what injuries we receive you will be astonished. Among many kinds of wrongs there are some which were utterly unknown before and entirely new to us—heathen, none of whom would dare to speak of them even in private conversation.

Foreigners in
Japan.

One of the excuses offered by foreign nations is that our country is not yet civilized. Is it the principle of civilized law that the rights and profits of the so-called uncivilized or the weaker should be sacrificed? As I understand it, the spirit and the necessity of law is to protect the rights and welfare of the weaker against the aggression of the stronger; but I have never learned in my shallow studies of law that the weaker should be sacrificed for the stronger. Another kind of apology comes from the religious source, and the claim is made that the Japanese are idolaters and heathen. Whether our people are idolaters or not you will know at once if you will investigate our religious views without prejudice from authentic Japanese sources.

But admitting, for the sake of argument, that we are idolaters and heathen, is it Christian morality to trample upon the rights and advantages of a non-Christian nation, coloring all their natural happiness with the dark stain of injustice? I read in the Bible, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also;" but I

In Doubt
About Advice.

cannot discover there any passage which says, "Whosoever shall demand justice of thee smite his right cheek, and when he turns smite the other also." Again, I read in the Bible, "If any man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also;" but I cannot discover there any passage which says, "If thou shalt sue any man at the law, and take away his coat, let him give thee his cloak also."

You send your missionaries to Japan and they advise us to be moral and believe Christianity. We like to be moral; we know that Christianity is good, and we are very thankful for this kindness. But at the same time our people are rather perplexed and very much in doubt about this advice. For we think that the treaty stipulated in the time of feudalism, when we were yet in our youth, is still clung to by the powerful nations of Christendom; when we find that every year a good many western vessels engaged in the seal fishery are smuggled into our seas; when legal cases are always decided by the foreign authorities in Japan unfavorably to us; when some years ago a Japanese was not allowed to enter a university on the Pacific coast of America because of his being of a different race; when a few months ago the school board in San Francisco enacted a regulation that no Japanese should be allowed to enter the public school there; when last year the Japanese were driven out in wholesale from one of the territories of the United States of America; when our business men in San Francisco were compelled by some union not to employ the Japanese assistants or laborers, but the Americans; when there are some in the same city who speak on the platforms against those of us who are already here; when there are many men who go in processions hoisting lanterns marked "Jap must go;" when the Japanese in the Hawaiian islands are deprived of their suffrage; when we see some western people in Japan who erect before the entrance of their houses a special post, upon which is the notice, "No Japanese is allowed to enter here," just like a board upon which is written, "No dogs allowed;" when we are in such a situation is it unreasonable—notwithstanding the kindness of the western nations, from one point of view, who send their missionaries to us—for us intelligent heathen to be embarrassed and hesitate to swallow the sweet and warm liquid of the heaven of Christianity? If such be the Christian ethics, well, we are perfectly satisfied to be heathen.

False
Christianity
sailed.
As—

If any person should claim that there are many people in Japan who speak and write against Christianity, I am not a hypocrite and I will frankly state that I was the first in my country who ever publicly attacked Christianity; no, not real Christianity, but false Christianity, the wrongs done toward us by the people of Christendom. If any reprove the Japanese because they have had strong anti-Christian societies, I will honestly declare that I was the first in Japan who ever organized a society against Christianity; no, not against real Christianity, but to protect ourselves from false Christianity and the injustice which we receive from the people of Christendom. Do not think that

I took such a stand on account of my being a Buddhist, for this was my position many years before I entered the Buddhist temple. But, at the same time, I will proudly state that if any one discussed the affinity of all religions before the public, under the title of Synthetic religion, it was I. I say this to you because I do not wish to be understood as a bigoted Buddhist sectarian.

Really, there is no sectarian in my country. Our people well know what abstract truth is in Christianity, and we, or at least I, do not care about the names if I speak from the point of teaching. Whether Buddhism is called Christianity or Christianity is named Buddhism, whether we are called Confucianists or Shintoists, we are not particular; but we are very particular about the truth taught and its consistent application. Whether Christ saves us or drives us into hell, whether Gautama Buddha was a real person or there never was such a man, it is not a matter of consideration to us; but the consistency of doctrine and conduct is the point on which we put the greater importance. Therefore, unless the inconsistency which we observe is renounced, and especially the unjust treaty by which we are entailed is revised upon an equitable basis, our people will never cast away their prejudice about Christianity, in spite of the eloquent orator who speaks its truth from the pulpit. We are very often called barbarians, and I have heard and read that Japanese are stubborn and cannot understand the truth of the Bible. I will admit that this is true in some sense, for, though they admire the eloquence of the orator and wonder at his courage, though they approve his logical argument, yet they are very stubborn and will not join Christianity as long as they think it is a western morality to preach one thing and practice another.

But I know this is not the morality of the civilized west, and I have the firm belief in the highest humanity and noblest generosity of the occidental nations toward us. Especially as to the American nation, I know their sympathy and integrity. I know their sympathy by their emancipation of the colored people from slavery. I know their integrity by the patriotic spirit which established the independence of the United States of America. And I feel sure that the circumstances which made the American people declare independence are in some sense comparable to the present state of my country. I cannot refrain my thrilling emotion and sympathetic tears whenever I read the Declaration of Independence. You, citizens of this glorious free United States, who struck when the right time came, struck for "Liberty or Death;" you, who waded through blood that you might fasten to the mast your banner of the stripes and stars upon the land and sea; you, who enjoy the fruition of your liberty through your struggle for it; you, I say, may understand somewhat our position, and as you asked for justice from your mother country, we, too, ask justice from these foreign powers."

Admiration for
Americans.



Buddhist Temple, Bangkok, Siam.

What Buddhism Has Done for Japan.

Paper by HORIN TOKI, of Japan.



HAVE had the pleasure of speaking something about Buddhism, and I now again take the liberty of speaking something further about Buddhism, so that you may understand that religion, as well as its relation to our sunrise land of Japan, much better. In "chidown," which means, translated into English, "degrees of wisdom," it is said that all Buddhas teach in two ways. One is to teach the truth of doctrine; the other is to guide the goodness and righteousness of mankind. The former teaches us that our body and spirit are always in constant connection with the outside world and regulated by the absolute truth, which, having no beginning or no end, fills the universe and yet performs the endless action of cause and effect as in a circle. For instance, God in Christianity, the absolute extremity in Confucianism, Ameno Minakushi no mikoto in Shintoism, Borankamma in Brahminism, are established in order to show the truth of the universe.

The latter—that is to guide the goodness and righteousness of mankind—inspires us with purity and righteousness in our body and mind. In other words, it teaches us that absolute truth is constantly acting to make a man on the surface of the earth complete his purity and goodness. Therefore, should I speak from the side of goodness, I should say that Buddhism teaches ten commandments, such as not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to tell a falsehood, not to joke, not to speak evil of others, not to use double tongue, not to be greedy, neither be stingy, not to be cruel. Such commandments guide us into morality and goodness kindly and minutely by regulating our everyday personal action. Such commandments, by pacifying, purifying and enlightening our passions, as well as our wisdom, shall in the run of its course make the present society, which is full of vice, hatred and struggles or race, just like hungry dogs or wolves, a holy paradise of purity, peace and love. The regulating power of such command-

Ten Com.
mandments.



ments shall turn this troublesome world into the spiritual kingdom of fraternity and humanity.

This is only one illustration of Buddhist preaching; therefore, you see that Buddhism does not quarrel with other religions about the truth. If there were a religion which teaches the truth in the same way Buddhism regards it as the truth of Buddhism disguised under the garment of other religion. Buddhism never cares what the outside garment might do. It only aims to promote the purity and morality of mankind. It never asks who discovered it? It only appreciates the goodness and righteousness. It helps the others in the purification of mankind. Buddha himself called Buddhism "a round, circulating religion," which means the truth common to every religion, regardless of the outside garment. The absolute truth must not be regarded as the monopolization of one religion of another. The truth is the broadest and widest. In short, Buddhism teaches us that the Buddhism is truth, the goddess of truth who is common to every religion, but who showed her true phase to us through the Buddhism.

A Living
Spirit and
Nationality.

And now let me tell you that this Buddhism has been a living spirit and nationality of our beloved Japan for so many years and will be forever. Consequently, the Japanese people, who have been constantly guided by this beautiful star of truth of Buddha's, are very hospitable for other religions and countries, and are entirely different from some other obstinate nations. I say this without the least boast. Nay, I say this from simplicity and purity of mind. The Japanese of thirty years since—that is since we opened our country for foreigners—will prove to you that our country is quite unequaled on the way of picking up what is good and right, even done by others. We never say who invented this? which country brought that? The things of good nature have been most heartily accepted by us, regardless of race and nationality. Is this not the precious gift of the truth of Buddhism, the spirit of our country?

But don't too hastily conclude that we are only blind in imitating others. We have our own nationality; let me assure you that we have our own spirit. But we are not so obstinate to deny even what is good. So we trust in the unity of truth, but do not believe in the Creator fancied out by the imperfect brain of human beings. We also firmly reserve our own nationality as to manner, customs, arts, literature, benevolence, architecture and language. We have a charming and lovely nationality which characterizes all customs and relation between the sexes, between old and young and so on with peace and gentleness. You may think me too boastful, but allow me to warrant you that in traveling into the interior of Japan you will never be received with the salutation of "Hello, John." You will never be received with the salutation, "Hello, Jack." Nay, our people are not so impolite—none of them. Everywhere you go you will receive hearty welcome and kind hospitality.

Not only this, you are well aware of the fact that Japan has her own originality in fine arts, sculpture, painting, architecture, etc.

Should you doubt me, please trouble yourself to come over to Japan, where the beautiful mountains and clear streams will welcome you with smiles and open heart. Japan, though small in area, with the glorious rising as well as the setting sun, which shines over the beautiful cherry tree flowers, will do her very best to please you. The Japanese fine arts productions, which abound in all the cities of Japan, will tell you their own history. Not only is there the beautiful climate, which will tempt you to forget the departure from Japan, but I say that you ladies and gentlemen are not so weak as to be tempted by climate or the other things so far as to forget your country; but the respect, courtesy, kindness and hospitality you will constantly receive there might, perhaps, make it too hard for you to leave Japan without shedding tears. You must not think that this is spoken by one mortal Horin Toki, of Japan, but it is spoken to you by the truth, who borrowed my tongue. Truly, it is.

And let me ask you, who do you think originated such beautiful customs and the fine arts of worldwide reputation in Japan? Allow me to assure you that it was Buddhism. I have no time to count, one by one, what Buddhism has wrought out in Japan during the past eleven hundred years. But one word is enough—Buddhism is the spirit of Japan; her nationality is Buddhism. This is the true state of Japan. But it is a pity that we see some false and obstinate religionists, who, comparing these promising Japanese with the South Islanders, have been so carelessly trying to introduce some false religion into our country. As I said before, we Buddhists welcome any who are earnest seekers after the truth, but can we keep silent to see the falsehood disturbing the peace and nationality of our country? The hateful rumor of the collision taking place between the two parties is sometimes spread abroad. We, from the standpoint of love to our country, cannot overlook this falsehood and violation of peace and fraternity. Do you think it is right for one to urge upon a stranger to believe what he does not like and call that stranger foolish, barbarous, ignorant and obstinate on account of the latter's denying the proposition made by the former? Do you think it is right for the former to excite the latter by calling so many names and producing social disorder? I should say that such a one as that is against peace, love and order, fraternity and humanity. I should say that such a one as that is against the truth. He who is against the truth had better die. Justice does conquer injustice, and we are glad to see that the cloud of falsehood is gradually disappearing before the light of truth. Also, you ladies and gentlemen who are assembled now here are the friends of truth. Nay, you are amidst the truth. You breathe the truth as you do the air. And you surely indorse my opinion, because it is nothing but the truth.

Originator of
Fine Arts.

Buddhism as It Exists in Siam.

Paper by H. R. H. PRINCE CHANDRADAT CHUDHADHARN, of Siam.



BUDDHISM, as it exists in Siam, teaches that all things are made up from the Dharma, a Sanscrit term meaning the "essence of nature." The Dharma presents the three following phenomena, which generally exist in every being: 1. The accomplishment of eternal evolution. 2. Sorrow and suffering, according to human ideas. 3. A separate power, uncontrollable by the desire of man, and not belonging to man.

The Dharma is formed of two essences, one known as matter, the other known as spirit. These essences exist for eternity; they are without beginning and without end; the one represents the world and the corporeal parts of man, and the other the mind of man. The three phenomena combined are the factors for molding forms and creating sensations. The waves of the ocean are formed but of water, and the various shapes they take are dependent upon the degree of motion in the water; in similar manner the Dharma represents the universe, and varies according to the degree of evolution accomplished within it. Matter is called in the Pali "Rupa," and spirit "Nama." Everything in the universe is made up of Rupa and Nama, or matter and spirit, as already stated. The difference between all material things, as seen outwardly, depends upon the degree of evolution that is inherent to matter; and the difference between all spirits depends upon the degree of will, which is the evolution of spirit. These differences, however, are only apparent; in reality, all is one and the same essence, merely a modification of the one great eternal truth, Dharma.

Eternal Evolution.

Man, who is an aggregate of Dharma, is, however, unconscious of the fact, because his will either receives impressions and becomes modified by mere visible things, or because his spirit has become identified with appearances, such as man, animal, deva or any other beings that are also but modified spirits and matter. Man becomes,

therefore, conscious of separate existence. But all outward forms, man himself included, are made to live or to last for a short space of time only. They are soon to be destroyed and recreated again and again by an eternal evolution. He is first body and spirit, but, through ignorance of the fact that all is Dharma and of that which is good and evil, his spirit may become impressed with evil temptation. Thus, for instance, he may desire certain things with that force peculiar to a tiger, whose spirit is modified by craving for lust and anger. In such a case he will be continually adopting, directly or indirectly, in his own life, the wills and acts of that tiger, and thereby is himself that animal in spirit and soul. Yet outwardly he appears to be a man, and is as yet unconscious of the fact that his spirit has become endowed with the cruelties of the tiger.

If this state continues until the body be dissolved or changed into other matter, be dead, as we say, that same spirit which has been endowed with the cravings of lust and anger of a tiger, of exactly the same nature and feelings as those that have appeared in the body of the man before his death, may reappear now to find itself in the body of a tiger suitable to its nature. Thus, so long as man is ignorant of that nature of Dharma and fails to identify that nature, he continues to receive different impressions from beings around him in this universe, thereby sufferings, pains, sorrows, disappointments of all kinds, death.

If, however, his spirit be impressed with the good qualities that are found in a superior being, such as the deva, for instance, by adopting in his own life the acts and wills of that superior being, man becomes spiritually that superior being himself, both in nature and soul, even while in his present form. When death puts an end to his physical body, a spirit of the very same nature and quality may reappear in the new body of a deva to enjoy a life of happiness, not to be compared to anything that is known in this world.

However, to all beings alike, whether superior or inferior to ourselves, death is a suffering. It is, therefore, undesirable to be born into any being that is a modification of Dharma, to be sooner or later, again and again, dissolved by the eternal phenomenon of evolution. The only means by which we are able to free ourselves from sufferings and death is therefore to possess a perfect knowledge of Dharma, and to realize by will and acts that nature only obtainable by adhering to the precepts given by Lord Buddha in the four noble truths. The consciousness of self-being is a delusion, so that, until we are convinced that we ourselves and whatever belongs to ourselves is a mere nothingness, until we have lost the idea or impression that we are men, until that idea be completely annihilated and we have become united to Dharma, we are unable to reach spiritually the state of Nirvana, and that is only attained when the bodies dissolve both spiritually and physically. So that one should cease all petty longing for personal happiness, and remember that one life is as hollow as the other, that all is transitory and unreal.

Death a Suffering.

The true Buddhist does not mar the purity of his self-denial by lusting after a positive happiness which he himself shall enjoy here or hereafter. Ignorance of Dharma leads to sin, which leads to sorrow; and under these conditions of existence each new birth leaves man ignorant and finite still. What is to be hoped for is the absolute repose of Nirvana, the extinction of our being nothingness. Allow me to give an illustration: A piece of rope is thrown in a dark road; a silly man passing by cannot make out what it is. In his natural ignorance the rope appears to be a horrible snake and immediately creates in him alarm, fright and suffering. Soon light dwells upon him; he now realizes that what he took to be a snake is but a piece of rope; his alarm and fright are suddenly at an end; they are annihilated, as it were; the man now becomes happy and free from the suffering he has just experienced through his own folly.

It is precisely the same with ourselves, our lives, our deaths, our alarms, our cries, our lamentations, our disappointments, and all other sufferings. They are created by our own ignorance of eternity, of the knowledge of Dharma to do away with and annihilate all of them.

I shall now refer to the four noble truths as taught by our Merciful and Omniscient Lord Buddha; they point out the path that leads to Nirvana, or to the desirable extinction of self.

Four
Truths. Noble

The first noble truth is suffering; it arises from birth, old age, illness, sorrow, death, separation and from what is loved, association with what is hateful, and, in short, the very idea of self in spirit and matters that constitute Dharma.

The second noble truth is the cause of suffering which results from ignorance, creating lust for objects of perishable nature. If the lust be for sensual objects it is called, in Pali, Kama Tanha. If it be for supersensual objects, belonging to the mind but still possessing a form in the mind, it is called Bhava Tanha. If the lust be pure for supersensual objects that belong to the mind but are devoid of all form whatever, it is called Wibhava Tanha.

The third noble truth is the extinction of sufferings, which is brought about by the cessation of the three kinds of lust, together with their accompanying evils, which all result directly from ignorance.

The fourth noble truth is the means of paths that lead to the cessation of lusts and other evils. This noble truth is divided into the following eight paths: Right understanding, right resolutions, right speech, right acts, right way of earning a livelihood, right efforts, right meditation, right state of mind. A few words of explanation on these paths may not be found out of place.

By right understanding is meant proper comprehension, especially in regard to what we call sufferings. We should strive to learn the cause of our sufferings and the manner to alleviate and even to suppress them. We are not to forget that we are in this world to suffer; that wherever there is pleasure there is pain, and that, after all, pain and pleasure only exist according to human ideas.

By right resolutions is meant that it is our imperative duty to act

kindly to our fellow creatures. We are to bear no malice against anybody and never to seek revenge. We are to understand that in reality we exist in flesh and blood only for a short time and that happiness and sufferings are transient or idealistic, and therefore we should try to control our desires and cravings and endeavor to be good and kind toward our fellow creatures.

By right speech is meant that we are always to speak the truth, never to incite one's anger toward others, but always to speak of things useful and never use harsh words destined to hurt the feelings of others.

By right acts is meant that we should never harm our fellow creatures, neither steal, take life nor commit adultery. Temperance and celibacy are also enjoined.

By right way of earning a livelihood is meant that we are always to be honest and never to use wrongful or guilty means to attain an end.

By right efforts is meant that we are to persevere in our endeavors to do good and to mend our conduct should we ever have strayed from the path of virtue.

By right meditation is meant that we should always look upon life as being temporary, consider our existence as a source of suffering, and therefore endeavor always to calm our minds that may be excited by the sense of pleasure or pain.


Right state of mind is meant that we should be firm in our belief and be strictly indifferent, both to the sense or feeling of pleasure and pain.

It would be out of place here to enter into further details on the four noble truths; it would require too much time. I will, therefore, merely summarize their meanings and say that sorrow and sufferings are mainly due to ignorance, which creates in our minds lust, anger and other evils. The extermination of all sorrow and suffering and of all happiness is attained by the eradication of ignorance and its evil consequences, and by replacing it with cultivation, knowledge, contentment and love.

Due to Ignorance.

Now comes the question, What is good and what is evil? Every act, speech or thought derived from falsehood, or that which is injurious to others is evil. Every act, speech or thought derived from truth and that which is not injurious to others is good. Buddhism teaches that lust prompts avarice; anger creates animosity; ignorance produces false ideas. These are called evils because they cause pain. On the other hand, contentment prompts charity, love creates kindness, knowledge produces progressive ideas. These are called good because they give pleasure.

The teachings of Buddhism on morals are numerous, and are divided into three groups of advantages—the advantage to be obtained in the present life, the advantage to be obtained in the future life, and the advantage to be obtained in all eternity. For each of these advantages there are recommended numerous paths to be followed by



those who aspire to any one of them. I will only quote a few examples:

To those who aspire to advantages in the present life Buddhism recommends diligence, economy, expenditure suitable to one's income, and association with the good.

To those who aspire to the advantages of the future life are recommended charity, kindness, knowledge of right and wrong.

To those who wish to enjoy the everlasting advantages in all eternity are recommended purity of conduct, of mind and of knowledge.

Advantages
in the Present
Life.

Allow me now to say a few words on the duties of man toward his wife and family as preached by the Lord Buddha himself to the lay disciples in different discourses, or suttas, as they are called in Pali. They belong to the group of advantages of the present life.

A good man is characterized by seven qualities: He should not be loaded with faults, he should be free from laziness, he should not boast of his knowledge, he should be truthful, benevolent, content and should aspire to all that is useful.

A husband should honor his wife, never insult her, never displease her, make her mistress of the house, and provide for her. On her part, a wife ought to be cheerful toward him when he works, entertain his friends and care for his dependents, to never do anything he does not wish, to take good care of the wealth he has accumulated, not to be idle but always cheerful when at work herself.

Parents in old age expect their children to take care of them, to do all their work and business, to maintain the household, and, after death, to do honor to their remains by being charitable. Parents help their children by preventing them from doing sinful acts, by guiding them in the path of virtue, by educating them, by providing them with husbands and wives suitable to them, by leaving them legacies.

When poverty, accident or misfortune befalls man, the Buddhist is taught to bear it with patience, and if these are brought on by himself it is his duty to discover their causes and try, if possible, to remedy them. If the causes, however, are not to be found here in this life he must account for them by the wrongs done in his former existence.

Temperance is enjoined upon all Buddhists for the reason that the habit of using intoxicating things tends to lower the mind to the level of that of an idiot, a mad man or an evil spirit.

These are some of the doctrines and moralities taught by Buddhism, which I hope will give you an idea of the scope of the Lord Buddha's teachings. In closing this brief paper, I earnestly wish you all, my brother religionists, the enjoyment of long life, happiness and prosperity.

Buddhism.

Paper by BANRIEU YATSUBUCHI, of Japan.



HE radiating light of the civilization of the present century, to be seen in Europe and America, is reflected on all corners of the earth. My country has already opened international intercourse and made rapid progress, owing to America, for which I return many thanks. The present state of the world's civilization, however, is limited always to the near material world, and it has not yet set forth the best, most beautiful and most truthful spiritual world. It is because every religion, stooping in each corner, neglects its duty of universal love and brotherhood. But, at last, the day came fortunately that all religions sent their members to attend the world's religious congress in connection with the Columbian exposition of 1893.

Buddhism is the doctrine taught by Buddha Shakyamuni. The word Buddha is Sanscrit and in Japanese it is Satorim, which means understanding or comprehension. It has three meanings—self comprehension, to let others comprehend and perfect comprehension. When wisdom and humanity are attained thoroughly by one he may be called Buddha, which means perfect comprehension. In Buddhism we have Buddha as our saviour, the spirit incarnate of perfect self-sacrifice and divine compassion, and the embodiment of all that is pure and good. Although Buddha was not a creator and had no power to destroy the law of the universe, he had the power of knowledge to know the origin of nature and end of each revolving manifestation of the universal phenomena. He suppressed the craving and passions of his mind until he could reach no higher spiritual and moral plane. As every object of the universe is one part of the truth, of course it may become Buddha, according to a natural reason.

The only difference between Buddha and all other beings is in point of supreme enlightenment. Keron Sutra teaches us that there is no distinction between Mind, Buddha and Beings, and Nirvana Su-

Buddha Defined.


tra also teaches us that all beings have the nature of Buddhahood. If one does not neglect to purify his mind and to increase his power of religion, he may take in the spiritual world or space and have cognizance of the past, present and future in his mind. Kishinron tells us that space has no limit, that the worlds are innumerable, that the beings are countless, that Buddhas are numberless. Buddhism aims to turn from the incomplete, superstitious world to the complete enlightenment of the world of truth.

Complete
Doctrines of
Buddha.

The complete doctrines of Buddha, who spent fifty years in elaborating them, were preached precisely and carefully, and their meanings are so profound and deep that I cannot explain at this time an infinitesimal part of them. His preaching was a compass to point out the direction to the bewildering spiritual world. He taught his disciples just as the doctor cures his patient, by giving several medicines according to the different cases. Twelve divisions of sutras and eighty-four thousand laws, made to meet the different cases of Buddha's patients in the suffering world, are minute classifications of Buddha's teaching. Why are there so many sects and preachings in Buddhism? Simply because of the differences in human character. His teaching may be divided under four heads: Thinking about the general state of the world, thinking about the individual character simply, conquering the passions, giving up the life to the sublime first principle.

No Room for
Censure.

There is no room for censure because Buddhism has many sects which were founded on Buddha's teachings, because Buddha considered it best to preach according to the spiritual needs of his hearers, and leave to them the choice of any particular sect. We are not allowed to censure other sects, because the teaching of each guides us all to the same place at last. The necessity for separating the many sects arose from the fact that the people of different countries were not alike in dispositions, and could not accept the same truths in the same way as others. One teaching of Buddha contains many elements which are to be distributed and separated. But as the object, as taught by Buddha, is one, we teach the ignorant according to the conditions that arise through our different sects. If you wish to know about Buddhism thoroughly you must begin the study of it. Those of you who would care to know the outline of Buddhism might read Professor Nanjo's English translation of the "History of the Japanese Buddhist Sects." This will also give you a general idea of the Buddhism of Japan.



Interior of Buddhist Temple, Canton, China.

12-10-57-20-601

Buddhism and Christianity.

Paper by H. DHARMAPALA, of India.



AX MÜLLER says: "When a religion has ceased to produce champions, prophets and martyrs it has ceased to live in the true sense of the word, and the decisive battle for the dominion of the world would have to be fought out among the three missionary religions which are alive: Buddhism, Moham-
medanism and Christianity." Sir William W. Hunter, in his "Indian Empire" (1893), says: "The secret of Buddha's success was that he brought spiritual deliverance to the people. He preached that salvation was equally open to all men, and that it must be earned, not by propitiating imaginary deities, but by our own conduct. His doctrines thus cut away the religious basis of caste and had the efficiency of the sacrificial ritual and assailed the

supremacy of the Brahmans (priests) as the mediators between God and man." Buddha taught that sin, sorrow and deliverance, the state of man in this life, in all previous and in all future lives, are the inevitable results of his own acts (Karma). He thus applied the inexorable law of cause and effect to the soul. What a man sows he must reap.

As no evil remains without punishment and no good deed without reward, it follows that neither priest nor God can prevent each act bearing its own consequences. Misery or happiness in this life is the unavoidable result of our conduct in a past life, and our actions here will determine our happiness or misery in the life to come. When any creature dies he is born again, in some higher or lower state of existence, according to his merit or demerit. His merit or demerit—that is, his character—consists of the sum total of his actions in all previous lives.

By this great law of Karma Buddha explained the inequalities and apparent injustice of men's estate in this world as the consequence of

Results of His
Own Acts.

acts in the past, while Christianity compensates those inequalities by rewards in the future. A system in which our whole well-being, past, present and to come, depends on ourselves, theoretically leaves little room for the interference, or even existence, of a personal God. But the atheism of Buddha was a philosophical tenet, which, so far from weakening the functions of right and wrong, gave them new strength from the doctrine of Karma, or the metempsychosis of character. To free ourselves from the thralldom of desire and from the fetters of selfishness was to attain to the state of the perfect disciple, Arhat, in this life and to the everlasting rest after death.

Practical Aim
of Buddha's
Teaching.

The great practical aim of Buddha's teaching was to subdue the lusts of the flesh and the cravings of self, and this could only be attained by the practice of virtue. In place of rites and sacrifices Buddha prescribed a code of practical morality as the means of salvation. The four essential features of that code were: Reverence to spiritual teachers and parents, control over self, kindness to other men, and reverence for the life of all creatures. He urged on his disciples that they must not only follow the true path themselves, but that they should teach it to all mankind.

The life and teachings of Buddha are also beginning to exercise a new influence on religious thought in Europe and America. Buddhism will stand forth as the embodiment of the eternal verity that as a man sows he will reap, associated with the duties of mastery over self and kindness to all men, and quickened into a popular religion by the example of a noble and beautiful life.

Here are some Buddhist teachings as given in the words of Jesus and claimed by Christianity:

Whosoever cometh to Me and heareth My sayings and doeth them, he is like a man which built a house and laid the foundation on a rock.

Why call ye me Lord and do not the things which I say?

Judge not, condemn not, forgive.

Love your enemies and do good, hoping for nothing again, and your reward shall be great.

Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.

Be ready, for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not.

Sell all that ye have and give it to the poor.

Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry. But God said unto him: Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee, then whose shall these things be which thou hast provided?

The life is more than meat and the body more than raiment. Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath he cannot be My disciple.

He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful in much,

Whosoever shall save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it.

For behold the kingdom of God is within you.

There is no man that hath left house or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake who shall not receive manifold more in this present time.

Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always.

Here are some Buddhist teachings for comparison:

Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time. Hatred ceases by love. This is an ancient law. Let us live happily, not hating those who hate us. Among men who hate us, let us live free from hatred. Let one overcome anger by love. Let him overcome evil by good. Let him overcome the greedy by liberality, let the liar be overcome by truth.

Teachings for
Comparison.

As the bee, injuring not the flower, its color or scent, flies away, taking the nectar, so let the wise man dwell upon the earth.

Like a beautiful flower, full of color and full of scent, the fine words of him who acts accordingly are full of fruit.

Let him speak the truth, let him not yield to anger, let him give when asked, even from the little he has. By these things he will enter heaven.

The man who has transgressed one law and speaks lies and denies a future world, there is no sin he could not do.

The real treasure is that laid up through charity and piety, temperance and self-control; the treasure thus hid is secured, and passes not away.

He who controls his tongue, speaks wisely and is not puffed up; who holds up the torch to enlighten the world, his word is sweet.

Let his livelihood be kindness, his conduct righteousness. Then in the fullness of gladness he will make an end of grief.

He who is tranquil and has completed his course, who sees truth as it really is, but is not partial when there are persons of different faith to be dealt with, who with firm mind overcomes ill will and covetousness, he is a true disciple.

As a mother, even at the risk of her own life, protects her son, her only son, so let each one cultivate good will without measure among all beings.

Nirvana is a state to be realized here on this earth. He who has reached the fourth stage of holiness consciously enjoys the bliss of Nirvana. But it is beyond the reach of him who is selfish, skeptical, realistic, sensual, full of hatred, full of desire, proud, self-righteous and ignorant. When by supreme and unceasing effort he destroys all selfishness and realizes the oneness of all beings, is free from all prejudices and dualism, when he by patient investigation discovers truth, the stage of holiness is reached.

Among Buddhist ideals are self-sacrifice for the sake of others, compassion based on wisdom, joy in the hope that there is final bliss for the pure-minded, altruistic individual. The student of Buddha's

Buddhist
Ideals.

religion takes the burden of life with sweet contentment; uprightness is his delight; he encompasses himself with holiness in word and deed; he sustains his life by means that are quite pure; good is his conduct, guarded the door of his senses, mindful and self possessed, he is altogether happy.

H. T. Buckle, the author of the "History of Civilization," says: "A knowledge of Buddhism is necessary to the right understanding of Christianity. Buddhism is, besides, a most philosophical creed. Theologians should study it."

In his inaugural address delivered at the congress of orientals last year Max Müller remarked: "As to the religion of Buddha being influenced by foreign thought, no true scholar now dreams of that. The religion of Buddha is the daughter of the old Brahman religion and a daughter in many respects more beautiful than the mother. On the contrary, it was through Buddhism that India, for the first time, stepped forth from the isolated position and became an actor in the historical drama of the world."

Dr. Hoey, in his preface to Dr. Oldberg's excellent work on Buddha, says: "To thoughtful men who evince an interest in the comparative study of religious beliefs Buddhism, as the highest effort of pure intellect to solve the problem of being, is attractive. It is not less so to the metaphysician and the sociologist, who study the philosophy of the modern German pessimistic school and observe its social tendencies."

Dr. Rhys David says that Buddhism is a field of inquiry, in which the only fruit to be gathered is knowledge.

R. C. Dutt says: "The moral teachings and precepts of Buddhism have so much in common with those of Christianity that some connection between the two systems of religion has long been suspected. Candid inquirers who have paid attention to the history of India and of the Greek world during the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, and noted the intrinsic relationship which existed between these countries in scientific, religious and literary ideas, found no difficulty in believing that Buddhist ideas and precepts penetrated into the Greek world before the birth of Christ. The discovery of the Asoka inscription of Hirnar, which tells us that that enlightened emperor of India made peace with five Greek kings and sent Buddhist missionaries to preach his religion in Syria, explains to us the process by which the ideas were communicated. Researches into doctrines of the Therapeutics in Egypt, and of the Essenes in Palestine, leave no doubt, even in the minds of such devout Christian thinkers as Dean Mansel, that the movement which those sects embodied was due to Buddhist missionaries who visited Egypt and Palestine within two generations of the time of Alexander the Great. A few writers like Benson, Seydal and Lillie maintain that the Christian religion has sprung directly from Buddhism."



Buddhist Priest, Ceylon.

Buddha.

Paper by ZITSUZEN ASHITSU.



Is it not, really, a remarkable event in human history that such a large number of the delegates of different creeds are come together from every corner of the world, as in a concert, to discuss one problem of humanity—universal brotherhood—without the least jealousy? I am so happy in giving an address as a token of my cordial acceptance of the membership of this congress of religions.

My subject is Buddha. This subject might be treated in two ways, either absolutely or relatively. But if I were to take an absolute way I am afraid I should not be able to utter even a single word, because, when Buddha is observed at absolute perfection, there is no word in human tongue which is powerful enough to interpret the state of its grand enlightenment. So, meanwhile, I stoop down to the lower stage, that is, to the manner of relativity, in treating this subject, and will explain the highest human enlightenment, which is called Buddha, according to the order of its five attitudes; that is, denomination, personality, principle, function and doctrine.

Denomination. Buddha is a Sanskrit word and is translated Kakusha in Chinese language. The word Kaku means enlighten, so one who enlightened his own mind and also enlightened those of others was called Buddha. Buddha has three personalities, namely, Hosshin, Hoshin and Wojin. Now, in Hosshin, Ho means law and Shin means personality, so it is the name given to the personality of the constitution after the Buddha got the highest Buddhahood. This personality is entirely colorless and formless, but, at the same time, it has the nature of eternality, omnipresence, and unchangeableness. Hosshin is called Birushana in Sanskrit and Hen-issai-sho in Chinese, both meaning omnipresence.

Then, in Hoshin, Ho means effect, so this is the name given to the personality of the result, which the Buddha attained by refining

What the
Word Buddha
means.

his action. Its Sanskrit name is Rushana, and in Chinese it is Joman, in which Jo means clear and Man means fullness, and when put together it means a state of the mind free from lust and evil desire, but full of enlightened virtues instead.

This personality has another designation, which is called Jiynshin, meaning an enjoying personality. And it is again subdivided into two classes of Jijiyo and Vajiyo. Jijiyo means to enjoy the Buddha himself, the pleasure of attaining to the highest human virtues; while Tajiyu, which is also called world enlightenment, designates the Buddha's benevolent action of imparting his holy pleasure to his fellow beings with his supreme doctrine.

In short, the former is to enlighten one's own mind, while the latter is to enlighten those of others. These two make a whole as Hoshin, which is the name given to the personality of the constitution, as I mentioned before, attained by the Buddha by his self-culture. So this personality has a beginning, but no end.

Three Personalities in One.


Lastly, Wojin is the name given to a personality which spontaneously appears to all kinds of beings in any state and condition in order to preach and enlighten them equally. In Sanskrit it is called Shakammi, and in Chinese, Noninjakumoku. Jakumoku means calmness and Nonin means humanity. He is perfectly calm; therefore he is entirely free from life and death. He is perfectly humane; consequently is not content even in his state of Nirvana.

These three personalities which I have just briefly mentioned are the attributes of the Buddha's intellectual activity, and at the same time they are the attributes of his one supreme personality. Nay, in the way of explanation, we can say that these three personalities are not the monopoly of the Buddha, but we also are provided with the same attributes. Our constitution is Hoshin, our intellect is Hoshin, while our actions are Wojin. Then what is the difference between the ordinary beings and Buddha, who is most enlightened of all? Nothing but that he is developed, by his self-culture, to the highest state, while we ordinary beings are buried in the dust of passions. If we cultivate our minds we can, of course, clear off the clouds of ignorance and reach the same enlightened place with the Buddha.

So in my sect of Buddhism we, the ordinary beings, are also called Risoku Buddha, or beings with nature of Buddha. But, as our minds are unfortunately full of lusts and superstition, we cannot be called Kukyosoku Buddha, as Ahaka, or Gautama, is. He is so entitled because he has sprung up to the highest state of mental achievement, and there is no higher attainable. He says, in his sacred Sutra, "Bomino," "I am the Buddha already enlightened hereafter."

Personality. The person of Buddha is perfectly free from life and death. (Fusho fumetsu.) We call it Nehan or Nirvana. Nehan is divided into four classes: Honrai Jishoshojo Nehan, Uyo Nehan, Muyo Nehan, Mujusho Nehan.

Honrai Jishoshojo Nehan is the name given to the nature of Buddha, which has neither beginning nor end, and is perfectly clear of



lust like a perfect mirror. But such an excellent nature as I just mentioned is not the peculiar property of Buddha, but every being in the universe has just the same constitution as Buddha. So it is told in Kegon Sutra that "There is no slight distinction between Mind, Buddha and Beings."

Uyo Nehan is the name given to the state little advanced from the above, when we perceive that our solicitude is fleeting, our lives are inconstant, and even there is no such thing as ego. In this state our mind is quite empty and clear, but there still remains one thing, that is, the body. So it is called Nyo, or "something left."

Muyo Nehan is the state which has advanced one step higher than Uyo. In this Nehan our body and intellect come to entire annihilation and there nothing is traceable; therefore, this state is called Muyo, or "nothing left."

Mujusho Nehan is the highest state of Nirvana. In this state we get a perfect intellectual wisdom; we are no more subject to birth and death. Also, we become perfectly merciful; we are not content with the self-indulging state of highest Nirvana, but we appear to the beings of every class to save them from prevailing pains by imparting the pleasure of Nirvana.

These being the principal grand desires of Buddhahood, the four merciful vows accompany them, namely:

Four Mer-
ful Vows.

I hope I can save all the beings in the universe from this ignorance!

I hope I can abstain from my inexhaustible desires of ignorance!

I hope I can comprehend the boundless meaning of the doctrine of Buddha!

I hope I can attain the highest enlightenment of Buddhahood!

Out of these four classes of Nirvana the first and last are called the Nirvana of Mahayana, while the remaining are that of Hinayana.

Principle. The fundamental principle of Buddha is the mind, which may be compared to a boundless sea into which the thousand rivers of Buddha's doctrines flow; so it is Buddhism comprehends the whole mind.

The mind is absolutely so grand and marvelous that even the heaven can never be compared to its highness, while the earth is too short for measuring its thickness. It has shape neither long nor short, neither round nor square. Its existence is neither inside nor outside, nor even in the middle part of bodily structure. It is purely colorless and formless and appears freely and actively in every place throughout the universe. But for the convenience of studying its nature we call it, True Mind of Absolute Unity (Shinnyo).

It is told in Sutra that "all figures in the universe are stamped but by the one form." What does that one form mean? It is nothing but another designation of Absolute Unity and that stamps out figures, means the innumerable phenomena before our eyes which are the shadow or appearance of the Absolute Unity.

Thus the mind and the figure (or color) reflect each other; so the

mind cannot be seen without the figure and the figure cannot be seen without the mind. In other words, the figure and mind are standing relatively, so the figure cannot exist without the mind and the mind cannot exist without the figure. It is told in Sutra that "when we see color we see mind." There is nothing but the absolute mind-unity throughout the universe. Every form of figure such as heaven, earth, mountains, rivers, trees, grasses, even a man, or what else it might be, is nothing but the grand personality of absolute unity. And as this absolute unity is the only object with which Buddha enlightens all kinds of existing beings, so it is clear that the principle of Buddha is the mind.

**Essential
Functions.**

Function. Three sacred virtues are essential functions of Buddha, which are the sacred wisdom, the graceful humanity, and the sublime courage. Of these the sacred wisdom is also called absolute wisdom. Wisdom in ordinary is a function of mind which has the power of judging. When it is acting relatively to the lusts of mind it is called, in Buddhism, relative wisdom, and when standing alone, without relation to ignorance or superstition, it is called absolute wisdom. The Buddha with his absolute wisdom is called Monju Bosatsu, or Buddha of intellectual light (Chiye Kivo Butsu), or Myochi Mutorin (marvelous wisdom, nothing comparable).

The graceful humanity is a production of wisdom. When intellectual light shines, penetrating the clouds of ignorant superstition of all beings, they are free from suffering, misery, and endowed with an enlightened pleasure. It is told in Sutra: "The mind of Buddha is so full of humanity that he waits upon every being with an absolutely equal humanity."

The object of Buddha's own enlightenment is to endow with pleasure and happiness all beings without making a slight distinction among them. So it is told in Hokke Sutra that "Now all these three worlds (which, as a whole, means the universe) are possessed of my hand, all beings upon them are my loving children. These worlds are full of innumerable pains, from which I alone can save them."

The word "humanity" in Buddhism is interpreted in two ways. One is to tender and bring something up, while the other to pity and save. Again, the humanity of Buddha is divided into three classes, namely, humanity relating to all kinds of beings, humanity relating to the appearance, and humanity universally common to all things.

Now, firstly, humanity relating to all beings is the humanity with which Buddha comprehends the relation of all beings and saves them all alike, just as merciful parents would do their children. Secondly, humanity relating to the appearance is the humanity with which Buddha comprehends all phenomenal appearances which exist in relation to conditions and preserves them on the field of perfect unity, where there are no such distinctions as ego and non-ego, and no difference of beings. Thirdly, humanity which is universally common to all beings, is the humanity with which Buddha, appearing everywhere, saves all the beings according to their different conditions, as naturally as a

lodestone attracts iron. This is one of the four holy vows of Buddha, that is: "I hope I can save all the beings in the universe from their ignorance."

Although the Buddha have these two virtues of wisdom and humanity, he could never save a being if he had not another sacred virtue, that is, courage. But he had such wonderful courage as to give up his imperial priesthood, full of luxury and pleasure, simply for the sake of fulfilling his desire of salvation. Not only this, he will not spare any trouble or suffering, hardship or severity, in order to crown himself with spiritual success.

So Amita Buddha also said to himself that "firmness of mind will never be daunted amid an extreme of pains and hardships." Truly, nothing can be done without courage. Courage is the mother of success. Courage is the foundation of all requisites for success. It is the same in the saying of Confucius, "a man who has humanity in his mind, has, as a rule, certain courage."

Among the disciples of the Buddha, Kwan-on represents humanity, Monju represents wisdom and Sei-shi represents courage; so it is very manifest that these three sacred virtues are essential functions of Buddha.

Doctrine. After Shaku Buddha's departure from this world two disciples, Kasho and Suan, collected the dictations of his teachings. This is the first appearance of Buddha's book, and it was entitled "The Three Stores of Hinayana (Sanzo)," which means it contains three different classes of doctrine, namely, Kyo, or principle; Ritsu, or law, and Ron, or argument.

Doctrinal
Teachings.

Now, firstly, Kyo (Sanskrit Sutra) is a Chinese word which means permanent, so that it designates the principle which is permanent and is taken as the origin of the law of the Buddhist. Secondly, Ritsu (Sanskrit Vini) means a law or commandment, so that this portion of the stores contains the commandments founded by the Buddha to stop human evils. Thirdly, Ron (Sanskrit Abidharma) means argument or discussion, so this part contains all the arguments or discussions written by his disciples or followers.

These three stores being a part of Buddhist works, there is another collection of three stores which is called that of Mahayana, compiled by the disciples of the Buddha Monju Miroku, Anan, etc. Both the Hinayana and Mahayana were prevailing together among the countries of India for a long time after the Buddha's departure. But when several hundred years were passed they were gradually divided into three parts. One of them has been spread toward northern countries such as Thibet, Mongolia, Manchuria, etc. One has been spread eastward through China, Corea and Japan. Another branch of Buddhism is still remaining in the southern portion of Asiatic countries such as Ceylon, Siam, etc. These three branches are respectively called Northern Mahayana, Eastern Mahayana and Southern Hinayana, and at present Eastern Mahayana, in Japan, is the most powerful of all the Buddhist branches.

The difference between Mahayana and Hinayana is this: The former is to attain an enlightenment by getting hold of the intellectual constitution of Buddha, while the latter teaches how to attain Nirvana by obeying strictly the commandments given by Buddha. But if you would ask which is the principal part of Buddhism, I should say it is, of course, Mahayana, in which is taught how to become Buddha ourselves instead of Hinayana.

Hasty Con-
clusion.

There have been a great many Europeans and Americans who studied Buddhism with interest, but unfortunately they have never heard of Mahayana. They too hastily concluded that the true doctrine of Buddhism is Hinayana, and that so-called Mahayana is nothing but a portion of Indian pure philosophy. They are wrong. They have entirely misunderstood. They have only poorly gained, with their scanty knowledge, a smattering of Buddhism. They are entirely ignorant of the boundless sea of Buddha's doctrine rolling just beneath their feet. His preaching is really so great that the famous Chishidaishi, of ancient China, divided it into five epochs of time and eight teachings.

Right after Buddha attained his perfect enlightenment, he preached that all beings have the same nature and wisdom with him. This epoch is called Kegon.

Then he preached the Hinayana doctrine of four Agons; that is, Cho Agon, Chu Agon, Zo Agon, Zochi Agon. This doctrine is divided into three classes, namely, Shomon, Engaku, and Bosaku. Buddha preached and taught to the Shomon class of his followers the principle of four glorious doctrines, according to which one can attain Nirvana of Hinayana. First, the world is full of sufferings and miseries; second, superstitions and lusts come one after another and induce us to misconceive birth and death; third, the way of attaining Nirvana is to get rid of pains; fourth, calmness and emptiness is the profound state of Nirvana.

Next he preached to his followers of the Engaku class about the doctrine of twelve causes and conditions of human mind, which follow each other continually just like links in a chain—sudden appearance of idea, continuation of idea, intellect, uniting of intellect and body, completion of six organs, feeling, retaining, loving, catching, having birth, old age and death. In this class one is also able to attain Nirvana by closely pursuing the course of mental culture.

Then he taught six glorious behaviors to his followers of the Bosaku class, by which men become Buddha, such as charity, good behavior, forbearance, diligence, meditation, comprehension. These three teachings of Agon are what are called the three fundamental principles of Hinayana.

After he finished the teaching of Agon he began to preach the principle of Yuima, Shiyaku, Eyoga, Ryogon, etc. This was the means adopted by him to lead the disciples from Hinayana doctrine to Mahayana, and the time is called the Ho-do Epoch.

Next comes the epoch of Mahayana, or the time when he taught

the personality of wisdom, that it is perfectly spiritual and entirely colorless and formless. By this teaching he led his higher disciples to comprehend the constitution of the spiritual world.

And he at last brought his disciples to the highest summit of his doctrine, where he taught the perfect principle of absolute unity, the perfect enlightenment of true, grand Nirvana. This epoch is called the time of Hokke and Nehan (or Nirvana).

The five epochs are so arranged according to the development of the Shaka Buddha's preaching. His intention is simply to lead his followers into the glorious stage of true Nirvana, so he, for the sake of convenience, temporarily showed the truth at the first, and then proceeded step by step to the absolutely highest truth.

This is a brief explanation of the five epochs of Buddha's preaching. Now let me speak a few words of the so-called eight teachings.

First comes Ton, that is, sudden, and it is a teaching for the persons who have a quick perception. Second comes Zen, that is, by degrees, and it is a teaching for the class of beings who can only develop gradually, step by step. Third comes Himitsu, that is, secret, and it is the teaching which does not correspond to either of Ton or Zen, but which each understand separately. Fourth comes Fujo, that is, unfixed, and it is the teaching which corresponds to both Ton and Zen; it means that the teaching is not limited to any particular class at all, but sometimes it is for the beings with quick perception, while sometimes it is for the beings of gradual progress, or, in other words, it preaches as the case might demand. Fifth comes Zo, that is, a store, and it is the teaching of three collections of principles, law and argument. Sixth comes Tsu, that is, correspondence, and it is the preaching which corresponds with those three, the fifth, the seventh and the eighth. Seventh comes Beku, that is, difference, and it is a teaching quite different from those with which the last corresponds. Eighth comes En, that is, perfection, and it is the teaching of perfect absoluteness.

Five Epochs
of Preaching

Of these eight teachings, the first four are called the four kinds of teaching manners, while the last four are called the four kinds of teaching principle. These eight teachings are the doorway through which the Buddhists enter the perfect enlightenment.

Daizokyo, or "complete work of Shaku Buddha," is really a wonderful store of truth. Most students in Buddhism lose their courage and ambition at the first glance at this inexhaustible fountain of the truth, so profound in meaning. But still the pleasure once felt in digesting its meaning can never be forgotten, and will naturally lead scholars into deeper and deeper parts of the sea of spiritual tranquillity and calmness. They will at once understand that those deep problems are nothing but symbols of grand unity which is perfectly absolute from the human word. So, shortly before closing his eyes, Shaku Buddha said: "I have never spoken a word until now, since I attained to perfect enlightenment." If you understand what Shaku said you can easily see the greatness of Buddha or his attainment.

I am not an orator, neither a great talker, myself, but I sincerely

believe that your characteristic quick perception has made you understand what I have said hitherto, and that the miscomprehension you had about Buddha or Buddhism has been cleared off. But I hope you will not stay there satisfied with what you have hitherto understood. Go on, my dear brothers and sisters. Keep on, and you will at last succeed in crowning your future with the perfect enlightenment. It is for your own sake. Nay, not only for your own, but also for your neighbors. You occidental nations, working in harmony, have wrought out the civilization of the present century, but who will it be that establishes the spiritual civilization of the twentieth century? It must be you.

Flowers of
Truth.

You know very well that our sun-rising Island of Japan is noted for its beautiful cherry-tree flowers. But don't you know that our native country is also the kingdom where the flowers of truth are blooming in great beauty and profusion at all seasons? Come to Japan. Don't forget to take with you the truth of Buddhism. Ah, hail the glorious spiritual spring day, when the song and odor of truth invite you all out to our country for the search for holy paradise!

I do not believe it totally uninteresting to give here a short account of our Indo Busseki Kofuku Society, of Japan.

The object of this society is to restore and re-establish the holy places of Buddhism in India and to send out a certain number of Japanese priests to perform devotional services in them, and promote the convenience of pilgrims from Japan. These holy places are Buddha Gaya, where Buddha attained to the perfect enlightenment; Kapilavastu, where Buddha was born; the Deer Park, where Buddha first preached, and Kusinagara, where Buddha entered Nirvana.

Two thousand nine hundred and twenty years ago—that is, 1,026 years before Christ—the world became honored—Prince Siddhartha was born in the palace of his father, King Suddhodana, in Kapilavastu, the capital of the kingdom Magadha. When he was nineteen years old he began to lament men's inevitable subjection to the various sufferings of sickness, old age and death; and, discarding all his precious possessions and the heirship of the kingdom, he went into a mountain jungle to seek, by meditation and asceticism, the way of escape from these sufferings. After spending six years there and finding that the way he sought was not in asceticism, he went out from there and retired under the Bodhi tree, of Buddha Gaya, where at last, by profound meditation, he attained the supreme wisdom and became Buddha. The light of truth and mercy began to shine from him over the whole world, and the way of perfect emancipation was opened for all human beings, so that everyone can bathe in his blessings and walk in the way of enlightenment.

When the ancient King Asoka, of Magadha, was converted to Buddhism, he erected a large and magnificent temple over the spot to show his gratitude to the founder of his new religion.

But, sad to say, since the fierce Mohammedans invaded and laid waste the country, there being no Buddhist to guard the temple, its

possession fell into the hand of a Brahmanist priest, who chanced to come there and seized it.

It was early in the spring of 1891 that the Japanese priest, Rev. Shaku Kionen, in company with H. Dharmapala, of Ceylon, visited this holy ground. The great Buddha Gaya temple was carefully repaired and restored to its former state by the British government, but they could not help being very much grieved to see it subjected to much desecration in the hands of the Brahmanist, Mahant, and communicated to us their earnest desire to rescue it.

With warm sympathy for them and thinking, as Sir Edwin Arnold said, that it is not right for Buddhists to leave the guardianship of the holy center of a Buddhist's religion of grace to the hand of a Brahmanist priest, we organized this Indo Busseki Kofuku Society, in Japan, to accomplish the object above mentioned, in co-operation with the Maha Bodhi Society, organized by Mr. H. Dharmapala and other Buddhist brothers in India.

These are the outlines of the origin and object of our Indo Busseki Kofuku Society; and I believe our Buddha Gaya movement will bring people of all Buddhist countries into closer connection and be instrumental in promoting the brotherhood among the people of the whole world.

Promotio
Brotherhoo



The Principles of the Brahmo-Somaj.

Paper by PROTAP CHUNDER MOZOOMDAR, of Calcutta, India.



Mother of Religion.

R. PRESIDENT, Representatives of Nations and Religions: I told you the other day that India is the mother of religion, the land of evolution. I am going this morning to give you an example, or demonstrate the truth of what I said. The Brahmo-Somaj, of India, which I have the honor to represent, is that example. Our society is a new society; our religion is a new religion; but it comes from far, far antiquity, from the very roots of our national life, hundreds of centuries ago.

Sixty-three years ago the whole land of India—the whole country of Bengal—was full of a mighty clamor. The great jarring noise of a heterogeneous polytheism rent the stillness of the sky. The cry of widows; nay, far more lamentable, the cry of those miserable women who had to be burned on the funeral pyre of their dead husbands, desecrated the holiness of God's earth.

We had the Buddhist, goddess of the country, the mother of the people, ten handed, holding in each hand the weapons for the defense of her children. We had the white goddess of learning, playing on her Vena, a stringed instrument of music, the strings of wisdom, because, my friends, all wisdom is musical; where there is a discord there is no deep wisdom. [Applause.] The goddess of good fortune, holding in her arms, not the horn, but the basket of plenty, blessing the nations of India, was there, and the god with the head of an elephant, and the god who rides on a peacock—martial men are always fashionable, you know, and the 33,000,000 of gods and goddesses besides. I have my theory about the mythology of Hinduism, but this is not the time to take it up.

Amid the din and clash of this polytheism and so-called evil, amid all the darkness of the times, there arose a man, a Brahman, pure bred and pure born, whose name was Raja Ram Dohan Roy. In his

boyhood he had studied the Arabic and Persian; he had studied Sanskrit, and his own mother was a Bengalee. Before he was out of his teens he made a journey to Thibet and learned the wisdom of the Lamas.

Before he became a man he wrote a book proving the falsehood of all polytheism and the truth of the existence of the living God. This brought upon his head persecution, nay, even such serious displeasure of his own parents that he had to leave his home for awhile and live the life of a wanderer. In 1830 this man founded a society known as the Brahmo-Somaj; Brahma, as you know, means God. Brahmo means the worshiper of God, and Somaj means society; therefore Brahmo-Somaj means the society of the worshipers of the one living God. While, on the one hand he established the Brahmo-Somaj, on the other hand he co-operated with the British government to abolish the barbarous custom of suttee, or the burning of widows with their dead husbands. In 1832 he traveled to England, the very first Hindu who ever went to Europe, and in 1833 he died, and his sacred bones are interred in Brisco, the place where every Hindu pilgrim goes to pay his tribute of honor and reverence.

This monotheism, the one true living God—this society in the name of this great God—what were the underlying principles upon which it was established? The principles were those of the old Hindu Scriptures. The Brahmo-Somaj founded this monotheism upon the inspiration of the Vedas and the Upanishads. When Rajar Ram Dohan Roy died his followers for awhile found it nearly impossible to maintain the infant association. But the spirit of God was there. The movement sprang up in the fullness of time. The seeds of eternal truth were sown in it; how could it die? Hence in the course of time other men sprang up to preserve it and contribute toward its growth. Did I say the spirit of God was there? Did I say the seed of eternal truth was there? There! Where?

Old Hindu
Scriptures.

All societies, all churches, all religious movements have their foundation, not without, but within the depths of the human soul. [Applause.] Where the basis of a church is outside the floods shall rise, the rain shall beat, and the storm shall blow, and like a heap of sand it will melt into the sea. Where the basis is within the heart, within the soul, the storm shall rise, and the rain shall beat, and the flood shall come, but like a rock it neither wavers nor falls. So that movement of the Brahmo-Somaj shall never fall. [Applause.] Think for yourselves, my brothers and sisters, upon what foundation your house is laid.

In the course of time, as the movement grew the members began to doubt whether the Hindu Scriptures were really infallible. In their souls, in the depth of their intelligence, they thought they heard a voice which here and there, at first in feeble accents, contradicted the deliverances of the Vedas and the Upanishads. What shall be our theological principles? Upon what principles shall our religion stand? The small accents in which the question first was asked became louder

and louder and were more and more echoed in the rising religious society until it became the most practical of all problems—upon what book shall true religion stand?

Briefly, they found that it was impossible that the Hindu Scriptures should be the only records of true religion. They found that the spirit was the great source of confirmation, the voice of God was the great judge, the soul of the indweller was the revealer of truth, and, although there were truths in the Hindu Scriptures, they could not recognize them as the only infallible standard of spiritual reality. So twenty-one years after the foundation of the Brahmo-Somaj the doctrine of the infallibility of the Hindu Scriptures was given up.


Extract from
all Scriptures.

Then a further question came. The Hindu Scriptures only not infallible! Are there not other Scriptures also? Did I not tell you the other day that on the imperial throne of India Christianity now sat with the Gospel of Peace in one hand and the scepter of civilization in the other? [Applause.] The Bible had penetrated into India; its pages were unfolded, its truths were read and taught. The Bible is the book which mankind shall not ignore. [Applause.] Recognizing, therefore, on the one hand, the great inspiration of the Hindu Scriptures, we could not but on the other hand recognize the inspiration and the authority of the Bible. [Applause.] And in 1861 we published a book in which extracts from all scriptures were given as the book which was to be read in the course of our devotions.

Our monotheism, therefore, stands upon all Scriptures. That is our theological principle, and that principle did not emanate from the depths of our own consciousness, as the donkey was delivered out of the depths of the German consciousness; it came out as the natural result of the indwelling of God's spirit within our fellow believers. No, it was not the Christian missionary that drew our attention to the Bible; it was not the Mohammedan priests who showed us the excellent passages in the Koran; it was no Zoroastrian who preached to us the greatness of his Zend-Avesta; but there was in our hearts the God of infinite reality, the source of inspiration of all the books, of the Bible, of the Koran, of the Zend-Avesta, who drew our attention to His excellencies as revealed in the record of holy experience everywhere. By His leading and by His light it was that we recognized these facts, and upon the rock of everlasting and eternal reality our theological basis was laid. [Loud applause.]

Reformation
of Society.

What is theology without morality? What is the inspiration of this book or the authority of that prophet without personal holiness—the cleanliness of this God-made temple and the cleanliness of the deeper temple within? Soon after we had got through our theology the question stared us in the face that we were not good men, pure minded, holy men, and that there were innumerable evils around us, in our houses, in our national usages, in the organization of our society. The Brahmo-Somaj, therefore, next laid its hand upon the reformation of society. In 1851 the first intermarriage was celebrated. Intermarriage in India means the marriage of persons belonging to different



castes. Caste is a sort of Chinese wall that surrounds every household and every little community, and beyond the limits of which no audacious man or woman shall stray. In the Brahmo-Somaj we asked, "Shall this Chinese wall disgrace the freedom of God's children forever?" Break it down; down with it, and away. [Cheers.]

Next, my honored leader and friend, Keshub Chunder Sen, so arranged that marriage between different castes should take place. The Brahmans were offended. Wiseacres shook their heads; even leaders of the Brahmo-Somaj shrugged up their shoulders and put their hands into their pockets. "These young firebrands," they said, "are going to set fire to the whole of society." But intermarriage took place, and widow marriage took place.

Do you know what the widows of India are? A little girl of ten or twelve years happens to lose her husband before she knows his features very well, and from that tender age to her dying day she shall go through penances and austerities and miseries and loneliness and disgrace which you tremble to hear of. I do not approve of or understand the conduct of a woman who marries a first time and then a second time and then a third time and a fourth time—who marries as many times as there are seasons in the year. [Laughter and applause.] I do not understand the conduct of such men and women. But I do think that when a little child of eleven loses what men call her husband, and who has never been a wife for a single day of her life, to put her to the wretchedness of a lifelong widowhood, and inflict upon her miseries which would disgrace a criminal, is a piece of inhumanity which cannot too soon be done away with. [Applause.] Hence intermarriages and widow marriages. Our hands were thus laid upon the problem of social and domestic improvement, and the result of that was that very soon a rupture took place in the Brahmo-Somaj. We young men had to go—we, with all our social reform—and shift for ourselves as we best might. When these social reforms were partially completed there came another question.

We had married the widow; we had prevented the burning of widows; what about her personal purity, the sanctification of our own consciences, the regeneration of our own souls? What about our acceptance before the awful tribunal of the God of infinite justice? Social reform and the doing of public good is itself only legitimate when it develops into the all-embracing principle of personal purity and the holiness of the soul.

My friends, I am often afraid, I confess, when I contemplate the condition of European and American society, when your activities are so manifold, your work is so extensive that you are drowned in it and you have little time to consider the great questions of regeneration, of personal sanctification, of trial and judgment and of acceptance before God. That is the question of all questions. [Applause.] A right theological basis may lead to social reform, but a right line of public activity and the doing of good is bound to lead to the salvation of the doer's soul and the regeneration of public men.

What the
Widows of India
are.

After the end of the work of our social reform we were therefore led into this great subject, How shall this unregenerate nature be regenerated; this defiled temple, what waters shall wash it into a new and pure condition? All these motives and desires and evil impulses, the animal inspirations, what will put an end to them all, and make man what he was, the immaculate child of God, as Christ was, as all regenerated men were? [Applause.] Theological principle first, moral principle next, and in the third place the spiritual of the Brahmo-Somaj.

Secret of Personal Holiness.

Devotions, repentance, prayer, praise, faith; throwing ourselves entirely and absolutely upon the spirit of God and upon His saving love. Moral aspirations do not mean holiness; a desire of being good does not mean to be good. The bullock that carries on his back hundred-weights of sugar does not taste a grain of sweetness because of its unbearable load. And all our aspirations, and all our fine wishes, and all our fine dreams and fine sermons, either hearing or speaking them—going to sleep over them or listening to them intently—these will never make a life perfect. Devotion only, prayer, direct perception of God's spirit, communion with Him, absolute self-abasement before His majesty; devotional fervor, devotional excitement, spiritual absorption, living and moving in God—that is the secret of personal holiness [Loud applause.]

Making Confessions.

And in the third stage of our career, therefore, spiritual excitement, long devotions, intense fervor, contemplation, endless self-abasement, not merely before God but before man, became the rule of our lives. God is unseen; it does not harm anybody or make him appear less respectable if he says to God: "I am a sinner; forgive me." But to make your confessions before man, to abase yourselves before your brothers and sisters, to take the dust off the feet of holy men, to feel that you are a miserable, wretched object in God's holy congregation—that requires a little self-humiliation, a little moral courage. Our devotional life, therefore, is two-fold, bearing reverence and trust for God and reverence and trust for man, and in our infant and apostolical church we have, therefore, often immersed ourselves into spiritual practices which would seem absurd to you if I were to relate them in your hearing.

Divine Perfection.

The last principle I have to take up is the progressiveness of the Brahmo-Somaj. Theology is good; moral resolutions are good; devotional fervor is good. The problem is, How shall we go on ever and ever in an onward way, in the upper path of progress and approach toward divine perfection? God is infinite; what limit is there in His goodness or His wisdom or His righteousness? All the Scriptures sing His glory; all the prophets in the heaven declare His majesty; all the martyrs have reddened the world with their blood in order that His holiness might be known. God is the one infinite good; and, after we had made our three attempts of theological, moral and spiritual principle, the question came that God is the one eternal and infinite, the inspirer of all human kind. The part of our progress then

lay toward allying ourselves, toward affiliating ourselves with the faith and the righteousness and wisdom of all religions and all mankind.

Christianity declares the glory of God; Hinduism speaks about His infinite and eternal excellence; Mohammedanism, with fire and sword, proves the almightiness of His will; Buddhism says how joyful and peaceful He is. He is the God of all religions, of all denominations, of all lands, of all Scriptures, and our progress lay in harmonizing these various systems, these various prophecies and developments into one great system. Hence the new system of religion in the Brahmo-Somaj is called the New Dispensation. The Christian speaks in terms of admiration of Christianity; so does the Hebrew of Judaism; so does the Mohammedan of the Koran; so does the Zoroastrian of the Zend-Avesta. The Christian admires his principles of spiritual culture; the Hindu does the same; the Mohammedan does the same.

God of Religions.

But the Brahmo-Somaj accepts and harmonizes all these precepts, systems, principles, teachings and disciplines and makes them into one system, and that is his religion. For a whole decade, my friend, Keshub Chunder Sen, myself and other apostles of the Brahmo-Somaj have traveled from village to village, from province to province, from continent to continent, declaring this new dispensation and the harmony of all religious prophecies and systems unto the glory of the one true, living God. But we are a subject race; we are uneducated; we are incapable; we have not the resources of money to get men to listen to our message. In the fullness of time you have called this august parliament of religions, and the message that we could not propagate you have taken into your hands to propagate. We have made that the gospel of our very lives, the ideal of our very being.

Precepts Harmonised

I do not come to the sessions of this parliament as a mere student, not as one who has to justify his own system. I come as a disciple, as a follower, as a brother. May your labors be blessed with prosperity, and not only shall your Christianity and your America be exalted, but the Brahmo-Somaj will feel most exalted; and this poor man who has come such a long distance to crave your sympathy and your kindness shall feel himself amply rewarded.

Comes as Brother.

May the spread of the New Dispensation rest with you and make you our brothers and sisters. Representatives of all religions, may all your religions merge into the Fatherhood of God and in the brotherhood of man, that Christ's prophecy may be fulfilled, the world's hope may be fulfilled, and mankind may become one kingdom with God, our Father. [Loud cheers.]



Prayer in a Moorish Mosque.

The Spiritual Ideas of the Brahmo-Somaj.

Paper by B. NAGARKAR, of Bombay.



THE last few days various faiths have been pressing their claims upon your attention. And it must be a great puzzle and perplexity for you to accept any of these or all of these. But during all these discussions and debates I would earnestly ask you all to keep in mind one prominent fact—that the essence of all these faiths is one and the same. The truth that lies at the root of them all is unchanged and unchanging. But it requires an impartial and dispassionate consideration to understand and appreciate this truth. One of the poets of our country has said:

“When Scriptures differ, and faiths disagree, a man should see truth reflected in his own spirit.”

This truth cannot be observed unless we are prepared to forget the accident of our nationality. We are all too apt to be carried away for or against a system of religion by our false patriotism, insular nationality and scholarly egotism. This state of the heart is detrimental to spiritual culture and spiritual development. Self-annihilation and self-effacement are the only means of realizing the verities of the spiritual world. The mind of man is like a lake; and just as the clear and crystal image of the evening moon cannot be faithfully reflected on the surface of the lake so long as the waters are disturbed by storms and waves, so in the same way spiritual truths cannot be imaged in the heart of man so long as his mind is disturbed by the storms of false pride and partial prejudice.

I stand before you as an humble member of the Brahmo-Somaj, and if the followers of other religions will commend to your attention their own respective creeds, my humble attempt will be to place before you the liberal and cosmopolitan principles of my beloved church.

The fundamental, spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is belief in the existence of one true God. Now, the expression, belief in the existence of God, is nothing new to you. In a way you all believe in

Detriment to
Spiritual Cul-
ture.

God, but to us of the Brahmo-Somaj that belief is a stern reality; it is not a logical idea; it is nothing arrived at after an intellectual process. It must be our aim to feel God, to realize God in our daily spiritual communion with Him. We must be able, as it were, to feel His touch; to feel as if we were shaking hands with Him. This deep, vivid, real and lasting perception of the Supreme Being is the first and foremost ideal of the theistic faith.

You, in the western countries, are too apt to forget this ideal. The ceaseless demand on your time and energy, the constant worry and hurry of your business activity and the artificial conditions of your western civilization are all calculated to make you forgetful of the personal presence of God. You are too apt to be satisfied with a mere belief; perhaps at the best, a notional belief in God. The eastern does not live on such a belief, and such a belief can never form the life of a lifegiving faith. It is said that the way to an Englishman's heart is through his stomach; that is, if you wish to reach his heart you must do so through the medium of that wonderful organ called the stomach. The stomach, therefore, is the life of an Englishman, and all his life rests in his stomach.

Livee by Sight. Wherein does the heart of a Hindu lie? It lies in his sight. He is not satisfied unless and until he has seen God. The highest dream of his spiritual life is God-vision—the seeing and feeling in every place and at every time the presence of a Supreme Being. He does not live by bread, but by sight.

The second spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is the unity of truth. We believe that truth is born in time but not in a place. No nation, no people, or no community has any exclusive monopoly of God's truth. It is a misnomer to speak of truth as Christian truth, Hindu truth, or Mohammedan truth.

Truth is the body of God. In His own providence He sends it through the instrumentality of a nation or a people, but that is no reason why that nation or that people should pride themselves for having been the medium of that truth. Thus, we must always be ready to receive the Gospel truth from whatever country and from whatever people it may come to us. We all believe in the principle of free trade or unrestricted exchange of goods. And we eagerly hope and long for the golden day when people of every nation and of every clime will proclaim the principle of free trade in spiritual matters as ardently and as zealously as they are doing in secular affairs or in industrial matters.

Unity of Truth. It appears to me that it is the duty of us all to put together the grand and glorious truths believed in and taught by different nations of the world. This synthesis of truth is a necessary result of the recognition of the principle of the unity of truth. Owing to this character of the Brahmo-Somaj the church of Indian theism has often been called an eclectic church; yes, the religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is the religion of eclecticism—of putting together the spiritual truths of the entire humanity and of earnestly striving after assimilating them

with our spiritual being. The religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is inclusive and not exclusive.

The third spiritual ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is the harmony of prophets. We believe that the prophets of the world—spiritual teachers such as Vyas and Buddha, Moses and Mohammed, Jesus and Zoroaster, all form a homogeneous whole. Each has to teach mankind his own message. Every prophet was sent from above with a distinct message, and it is the duty of us who live in these advanced times to put these messages together and thereby harmonize and unify the distinctive teachings of the prophets of the world. It would not do to accept the one and reject all the others, or to accept some and reject even a single one. The general truths taught by these different prophets are nearly the same in their essence; but, in the midst of all these universal truths that they taught, each has a distinctive truth to teach, and it should be our earnest purpose to find out and understand this particular truth. To me Vyas teaches how to understand and apprehend the attributes of Divinity. The Jewish prophets of the Old Testament teach the idea of the sovereignty of God; they speak of God as a king, a monarch, a sovereign who rules over the affairs of mankind as nearly and as closely as an ordinary human king. Mohammed, on the other hand, most emphatically teaches the idea of the Unity of God. He rebelled against the trinitarian doctrine imported into the religion of Christ through Greek and Roman influences. The monotheism of Mohammed is hard and unyielding, aggressive and almost savage. I have no sympathy with the errors or erroneous teachings of Mohammedanism, or of any religion for that matter. In spite of all such errors Mohammed's ideal of the Unity of God stands supreme and unchallenged in his teachings.

Buddha, the great teacher of morals and ethics, teaches in most sublime strains the doctrine of Nirvana, or self-denial and self-effacement. This principle of extreme self-abnegation means nothing more than the subjugation and conquest of our carnal self. For you know that man is a composite being. In him he has the angelic and the animal; and the spiritual training of our life means no more than subjugation of the animal and the setting free of the angelic.

Buddhism
teaches self-
denial.

So, also, Christ Jesus of Nazareth taught a sublime truth when he inculcated the noble idea of the Fatherhood of God. He taught many other truths, but the Fatherhood of God stands supreme above them all. The brotherhood of man is a mere corollary, or a conclusion, deduced from the idea of the Fatherhood of God. Jesus taught this truth in the most emphatic language, and, therefore, that is the special message that He has brought to fallen humanity. In this way, by means of an honest and earnest study of the lives and teachings of different prophets of the world, we can find out the central truth of each faith. Having done this, it should be our highest aim to harmonize all these and to build up our spiritual nature on them.

The religious history of the present century has most clearly shown the need and necessity of the recognition of some universal

Yearning for
Universal
Religion.

truths in religion. For the last several years there has been a ceaseless yearning, a deep longing after such a universal religion. The present parliament of religions, which we have been for the last few days celebrating with so much edification and ennoblement, is the clearest indication of this universal longing, and whatever the prophets of despondency, or the champions of orthodoxy, may say or feel, every individual who has the least spark of spirituality alive in him must feel that this spiritual fellowship that we have enjoyed for the last several days, within the precincts of this noble hall, cannot but be productive of much that leads toward the establishment of universal peace and good will among men and nations of the world.

To us of the Brahmo-Somaj this happy consummation, however partial and imperfect it may be for the time being, is nothing short of a sure foretaste of the realization of the principle of the harmony of prophets. In politics and in national government it is now an established fact that in future countries and continents on the surface of the earth will be governed, not by mighty monarchies or aristocratic autocracies, but by the system of universal federation. The history of political progress in your own country stands in noble evidence of my statement; and I am one of those who strongly believe that at some future time every country will be governed by itself as an independent unit, though in some respects may be dependent on some brother power or sister kingdom. What is true in politics will also be true in religion; and nations will recognize and realize the truths taught by the universal family of the sainted prophets of the world.

In the fourth place, we believe that the religion of the Brahmo-Somaj is a dispensation of this age; it is a message of unity and harmony; of universal amity and unification, proclaimed from above. We do not believe in the revelation of books and men, of histories and historical records. We believe in the infallible revelation of the Spirit—in the message that comes to man, by the touch of human spirit with the supreme spirit. And can we even for a moment ever imagine that the spirit of God has ceased to work in our midst? No, we cannot. Even today God communicates His will to mankind as truly and as really as he did in the days of Christ or Moses, Mohammed or Buddha.

Continuous
chain of Truths

The dispensations of the world are not isolated units of truth; but viewed as a whole, and followed out from the earliest to the latest in their historical sequence, they form a continuous chain, and each dispensation is only a link in this chain. It is our bounden duty to read the message of each dispensation in the light that comes from above, and not according to the dead letter that might have been recorded in the past. The interpretation of letters and words, of books and chapters, is a drag behind on the workings of the spirit. Truly hath it been said that the letter killeth. Therefore, brethren, let us seek the guidance of the Spirit and interpret the message of the Supreme Spirit by the help of His Holy Spirit.

Thus the Brahmo-Somaj seeks to Hinduize Hinduism, Moham-

danize Mohammedism, and Christianize Christianity. And whatever the champions of old Christian orthodoxy may say to the contrary, mere doctrine, mere dogma can never give life to any country or community. We are ready and most willing to receive the truths of the religion of Christ as truly as the truths of the religions of other prophets, but we shall receive these from the life and teachings of Christ Himself, and not through the medium of any church or the so-called missionary of Christ. If Christian missionaries have in them the meekness and humility, and the earnestness of purpose that Christ lived in His own life, and so pathetically exemplified in His glorious death on the cross, let our missionary friends show it in their lives.

Ready to Re-
ceive Truths.

We are wearied of hearing the dogmas of Christendom reiterated from Sunday to Sunday, from hundreds of pulpits in India, and evangelists and revivalists, of the type of Dr. Pentecost, who go to our country to sing to the same tune only add to the chaos and confusion presented to the natives of India by the dry and cold lives of hundreds and thousands of his Christian brethren. They come to India on a brief sojourn, pass through the country like birds of passage, moving at a whirlwind speed, surrounded by Christian fanatics and dogmatists, and to us it is no matter of wonder that they do not see any good, or having seen it do not recognize it, in any of the ancient or modern religious systems of India. Mere rhetoric is not reason, nor is abuse an argument, unless it be the argument of a want of common sense. And we are not disposed to quarrel with any people if they are inclined to indulge in these two instruments generally used by those who have no truth on their side. For these our only feeling is a feeling of pity—unqualified, unmodified, earnest pity, and we are ready to ask God to forgive them, for they know not what they say.

The first ideal of the Brahmo-Somaj is the ideal of the Motherhood of God. I do not possess the powers, nor have I the time to dwell at length on this most sublime ideal of the church of Indian theism. The world has heard of God as the Almighty Creator of the universe, as the Omnipotent Sovereign that rules the entire creation, as the Protector, the Saviour and the Judge of the human race; as the Supreme Being, vivifying and enlivening the whole of the sentient and insentient nature.


We humbly believe that the world has yet to understand and realize, as it never has in the past, the tender and loving relationship that exists between mankind and their Supreme, Universal, Divine Mother. Oh, what a world of thought and feeling is centered in that one monosyllabic word *ma*, which in my language is indicative of the English word mother. Words cannot describe, hearts cannot conceive of the tender and self sacrificing love of a human mother. Of all human relations the relation of mother to her children is the most sacred and elevating relation. And yet our frail and fickle human mother is nothing in comparison with the Divine Mother of the entire humanity, who is the primal source of all love, of all mercy and all purity.

Let us, therefore, realize that God is our Mother, the Mother of

God our Mother.

mankind, irrespective of the country or the clime in which men and women may be born. The deeper the realization of the Motherhood of God the greater will be the strength and intensity of our ideas of the brotherhood of man and the sisterhood of woman. Once we see and feel that God is our Mother all the intricate problems of theology, all the puzzling quibbles of church government, all the quarrels and wranglings of the so-called religious world will be solved and settled. We, of the Brahmo-Somaj family, hold that a vivid realization of the Motherhood of God is the only solution of the intricate problems and differences in the religious world.

May the Universal Mother grant us all Her blessings to understand and appreciate Her sweet relationship to the vast family of mankind. Let us approach Her footstool in the spirit of Her humble and obedient children.



Shintoism.

Paper by RT. REV. REUCHI SHIBATA, President of the Thikko Sect of Shintoism in Japan.



FEEL very happy to be able to attend this Congress of Religions as a member of the advisory council and to hear the high reasonings and profound opinions of the gentlemen who come from various countries of the world. As for me it will be my proper task to explain the character of Shintoism, and especially of my Jikko sect.

The word Shinto or Kami-no-michi, comes from the two words "Shin" or "Kami," each of which means Deity, and "to" or "michi" (way), and designates the way transmitted to us from our divine ancestors and in which every Japanese is bound to walk. Having its foundation in our old history, conforming to our geographical positions and the disposition of our people, this way, as old as Japan itself, came down to us with its original form and will last forever, inseparable from the Eternal Imperial House and the Japanese nationality.

According to our ancient scriptures there were a generation of Kami or deities in the beginning who created the heavens and the earth together with all things, including human beings, and became the ancestors of the Japanese.

Jimmu-tenno, the grandson of Ninigi-no-Mikoto, was the first of the human emperors. Having brought the whole land under one rule he performed great services to the divine ancestors, cherished his subjects and thus discharged his great filial duty, as did all the emperors after him. So also all the subjects were deep in their respect and adoration toward the divine ancestors and the emperors, their descendants. Though in the course of time various doctrines and creeds were introduced into the country, Confucianism in the reign of the fifteenth emperor, Ojin, Buddhism in the reign of the twenty-ninth emperor, Kimmei, and Christianity in modern times, the emperors and the subjects never neglected the great duty of Shinto. The present forms of

Its Foundation in Ancient History.

Nature and Origin of Religious Forms.

ceremony are come down to us from time immemorial in our history. Of the three divine treasures transmitted from the divine ancestors, the divine gem is still held sacred in the imperial palace, the divine mirror in the great temple of Iso, and the divine sword in the temple of Atsuta, in the province of Owari. To this day his majesty, the emperor, performs himself the ceremony of worship to the divine ancestors, and all the subjects perform the same to the deities of temples, which are called, according to the local extent of the festivity, the national, the provincial, the local and the birth-place temple. When the festival day of temples, especially of the birth-place, etc., comes, all people who, living in the place, are, considered specially protected by the deity of the temple have a holiday and unite in performing the ancient ritual of worship and praying for the perpetuity of the imperial line and for profound peace over the land and families. The deities dedicated to the temple are divine imperial ancestors, illustrious loyalists, benefactors to the place, etc. Indeed, the Shinto is a beautiful cultus peculiar to our native land and is considered the foundation of the perpetuity of the imperial house, the loyalty of the subjects, and the stability of the Japanese state.

Thus far I have given a short description of Shinto, which is the way in which every Japanese, no matter to what creed—even Buddhism, Christianity, etc.—he belongs, must walk. Let me explain briefly the nature and origin of a religious force of Shinto, *i. e.*, of the Jikko sect, whose tenets I profess to believe.

The Thikko (practical) sect, as the name indicates, does not lay so much stress upon mere show and speculation as upon the realization of the teachings. Its doctrines are plain and simple and teach man to do man's proper work. Being a new sect, it is free from the old dogmas and prejudices, and is regarded as a reformed sect. The scriptures on which the principal teachings of the sect are founded are Furukotobumi, Yamatobumi, and many others. They teach us that before heaven and earth came into existence there was one Absolute Deity called Amenominakanushi-no-kami. He has great virtue, and power to create to reign over all things; He includes everything within Himself, and He will last forever without end. In the beginning the One Deity, self-originated, took the embodiments of two Deities—one with the male nature and the other female. The male Deity is called Takai-musubi-no-kami, and the female Kami-musubi-no-kami. These two Deities are nothing but forms of the one substance and unite again in the Absolute Deity. These three are called the "Three Deities of Creation." They caused a generation of Deities to appear, who, in their turn, gave birth to the islands of the Japanese Archipelago, the sun and moon, the mountains and streams, the divine ancestors, etc., etc. So their virtue and power are esteemed wondrous and boundless.

According to the teachings of our sect we ought to reverence the famous mountain Fuji, assuming it to be the sacred abode of the Divine Lord, and as the brain of the whole globe. And as every child of the Heavenly Deity came into the world with a soul separated from

the one original soul of Deity, he ought to be just as the Deity ordered (in sacred Japanese "kanngara") and make Fuji the example and emblem of his thought and action. For instance, he must be plain and simple as the form of the mountain, make his body and mind pure as the serenity of the same, etc. We would respect the present world, with all its practical works, more than the future world; pray for the long life of the emperor and the peace of the country; and by leading a life of temperance and diligence, co-operating with one another in doing public good, we should be responsible for the blessings of the country.

Teachings
the Jikko se

The founder of this sect is Hasegawa Kakugyo, who was born in Nagasaki, of the Hizen province, in 1541. In the eighteenth year of his age, Hasegawa, full of grief at the gloomy state of things over the country, set out on a pilgrimage to various sanctuaries of famous mountains and lakes, Shintoistic and Buddhistic temples. While he was offering fervent prayers on sacred Fuji, sometimes its summit and sometimes within its cave, he received inspiration through the miraculous power of the mountain; and becoming convinced that this place is the holy abode of Ameno-mina-kanu-shi-no-kima, he founded a new sect and propagated the creed all over the empire.

After his death in the cave, in his 106th year, the light of the doctrines was handed down by a series of teachers. The tenth of them was my father, Shibata Hanamori, born at Ogi, of the Hizen province, in 1809. He was also in the eighteenth year of his age when he adopted the doctrine of this sect. Amid the revolutionary war of Meiji, which followed immediately, he exerted all his power to propagate his faith by writing religious works and preaching about the provinces.

Now I have given a short sketch of the doctrines of our religion and of its history. In the next place, let me express the humble views that I have had for some years on religion.

As our doctrines teach us, all animate and inanimate things were born from One Heavenly Deity, and every one of them has its particular mission; so we ought to love them all, and also to respect the various forms of religions in the world. They are all based, I believe, on the fundamental truth of religion. The difference between them is only in the outward form, influenced by variety of history, the disposition of the people and the physical conditions of the places where they originated.

Respect all
Religions.

Lastly, there is one more thought that I wish to offer here. While it is the will of Deity and the aim of all religionists that all His beloved children on the earth should enjoy peace and comfort in one accord, many countries look still with envy and hatred toward one another, and appear to seek opportunities of making war under the slightest pretext, with no other aim than of wringing out ransoms or robbing a nation of its lands. Thus, regardless of the abhorrence of the Heavenly Deity, they only inflict pain and calamity on innocent people. Now and here my earnest wish is this, that the time should come soon when

all nations on the earth will join their armies and navies with one accord, guarding the world as a whole, and thus prevent preposterous wars with each other. They should also establish a supreme court, in order to decide the case when a difference arises between them. In that state no nation will receive unjust treatment from another, and every nation and every individual will be able to maintain their own right and enjoy the blessings of Providence.

There will thus ensue, at last, the universal peace and tranquility which seem to be the final object of the benevolent Deity.⁴

Universal
Peace and
Tranquility.

For many years such has been my wish and hope. In order to facilitate and realize this in the future, I earnestly plead that every religionist of the world may try to edify the nearest people to devotion, to root out enmity between nations, and to promote our common object.



The Ethics and History of the Jains.

Paper by VIRCHAND A. GANDLHI, of Bombay.



WISH that the duty of addressing you on the history and tenets of the Jain faith world had fallen on an abler person than myself. The inclemency of the climate and the distant voyage which one has to undertake before he can come here have prevented abler Jains than myself from attending this grand assembly and presenting their religious convictions to you in person. You will, therefore, look upon me as simply the mouthpiece of Muni Almarimji, the learned high priest of the Jain community in India, who has devoted his whole life to the study of that ancient faith. I am truly sorry that Muni Almarimji is not among us to take charge of the duty of addressing you.

Without further preface I shall at once go to the subject of the day. It will be convenient to divide this paper into two parts: First, "The Philosophy and Ethics of the Jains;" second, "The History of the Jains."

Two Ways of
Looking at
Things.

First. Jainism has two ways of looking at things—one called Dravyarthekaraya and the other Paryayartheka Noya. I shall illustrate them. The production of a law is the production of something not previously existing, if we think of it from the latter point of view, *i. e.*, as a Paryaya, or modification; while it is not the production of something not previously existing if we look at it from the former point of view, *i. e.*, as a Dravya or substance. According to the Dravyarthekaraya view the universe is without beginning and end, but according to the Paryayartheka view we have creation and destruction at every moment.

The Jain canon may be divided into two parts: First, Shrute Dharma, *i. e.*, philosophy; and second, Chatra Dharma, *i. e.*, ethics.

The Shrute Dhafma inquiries into the nature of nine principles, six substances, six kinds of living beings and four states of existence—Jiva (sentient beings), Ajiva (non-sentient things), Punya (merit), Papa (demerit). Of the nine principles, the first is pua (soul). Ac-

According to the Jain view, soul is that element which knows, thinks and feels. It is, in fact, the divine element in the living being. The Jain thinks that the phenomena of knowledge, feeling, thinking and willing, are conditioned on something, and that that something must be as real as anything can be. This "soul" is in a certain sense different from knowledge, and in another sense identical with it. So far as one's knowledge is concerned the soul is identical with it, but so far as some one else's knowledge is concerned it is different from it. The true nature of soul is right knowledge, right faith and right conduct. The soul, so long as it is subject to transmigration, is undergoing evolution and involution.

Principle of
Non-Soul.

The second principle is non-soul. It is not simply what we understand by matter, but it is more than that. Matter is a term contrary to soul. But non-soul is its contradictory. Whatever is not soul is non-soul.

The rest of the nine principles are but the different states produced by the combination and separation of soul and non-soul. The third principle is *Punya* (merit), that, on account of which a being is happy, is *Punya*. The fourth principle is *Papa* (demerit), that on account of which a being suffers from misery. The fifth is *Ashrana*, the state which brings in merit and demerit. The seventh is *Nirjara*, destruction of actions. The eighth is *Bardha*, bondage of soul with *Karwa*, actions. The ninth is *Moksha*, total and permanent freedom of soul from all *Karwas* (actions).

Substance is divided into the sentient, or conscious, matter, stability, space and time. Six kinds of living beings are divided into six classes, earth body beings, water body beings, fire body beings, wind body beings, vegetables, and all of them having one organ of sense, that of touch. These are again divided into four classes of beings having two organs of sense, those of touch and of taste, such as tapeworms, leeches, etc.; beings having three organs of sense, those of touch, taste and smell, such as ants, lice, etc.; beings having four organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell and sight, such as bees, scorpions, etc.; beings having five organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing. There are human beings, animals, birds, men and gods. All these living beings have four, five or six of the following capacities: Capacity of taking food, capacity of constructing body, capacity of constructing organs, capacity of respiration, capacity of speaking and the capacity of thinking. Beings having one organ of sense, that is, of touch, have the first four capacities. Beings having two, three and four organs of sense, have the first five capacities, while those having five organs have all the six capacities.

The Jain canonical book treats very elaborately of the minute divisions of the living beings, and their prophets have long before the discovery of the microscope been able to tell how many organs of sense the minutest animalcule has. I would refer those who are desirous of studying Jain biology, zoology, botany, anatomy and physiology to the many books published by our society.

I shall now refer to the four states of existence. They are naraka, tiryarch, manushya and deva. Naraka is the lowest state of existence, that of being a denizen of hell; tiryarch is the next, that of having an earth body, water body, fire body, wind body, vegetable, of having two, three or four organs, animal and birds. The third is manushya, of being a man, and the fourth is deva, that of being a denizen of the celestial world. The highest state of existence is the Jain Moksha, the apotheosis in the sense that the mortal being by the destruction of all Karman attains the highest spiritualism, and the soul being severed from all connection with matter regains its purest state and becomes divine.

States of Existence.

Having briefly stated the principal articles of Jain belief, I come to the grand questions the answers to which are the objects of all religious inquiry and the substance of all creeds.

First. What is the origin of the universe?

This involves the question of God. Gautama, the Buddha, forbids inquiry into the beginning of things. In the Brahmanical literature bearing on the constitution of cosmos frequent reference is made to the days and nights of Brahma, the periods of Manuantara and the periods of Peroloya. But the Jains, leaving all symbolical expression aside, distinctly reaffirm the view previously promulgated by the previous hierophants, that matter and soul are eternal and cannot be created. You can affirm existence of a thing from one point of view, deny it from another, and affirm both existence and non-existence with reference to it at different times. If you should think of affirming both existence and non-existence at the same time from the same point of view, you must say that the thing cannot be spoken of similarly. Under certain circumstances the affirmation of existence is not possible; of non-existence and also of both.

What is meant by these seven modes is that a thing should not be considered as existing everywhere at all times in all ways and in the form of everything. It may exist in one place and not in another at one time. It is not meant by these modes that there is no certainty, or that we have to deal with probabilities only as some scholars have taught. Even the great Vedantist Sankaracharya has possibly erred when he says that the Jains are agnostics. All that is implied is that every assertion which is true is true only under certain conditions of substance, space, time, etc.

This is the great merit of the Jain philosophy, that while other philosophies make absolute assertions, the Jain looks at things from all standpoints and adapts itself like a mighty ocean in which the sectarian rivers merge themselves. What is God, then? God, in the sense of an extra cosmic personal creator, has no place in the Jain philosophy. It distinctly denies such creator as illogical and irrelevant in the general scheme of the universe. But it lays down that there is a subtle essence underlying all substances, conscious as well as unconscious, which becomes an eternal cause of all modifications and is termed God. But then the advocate of theism, holding that even

primordial matter had its first cause—the God—argues that “everything that we know had a cause. How, then, can it be but that the elements had a cause to which they are indebted for their existence?” That great philosopher, John Stuart Mill, replies:

A Permanent
and Changeable
Element in Na-
ture.

“The fact of experience, however, when correctly expressed, turns out to be, not that everything which we know derives its existence from the cause, but only every event or change. There is in nature a permanent element and also a changeable; the changes are always the effects of previous changes; the permanent existences, so far as we know, are not effects at all. It is true we are accustomed to say, not only of events, but of objects, that they are produced by causes, as water by the union of hydrogen and oxygen. But by this we only mean that when they begin to exist their beginning is the effect of a cause. But their beginning to exist is not an object, it is an event. If it be objected that the cause of a thing's beginning to exist may be said with propriety to be the cause of the thing itself I shall not quarrel with the expression. But that which in an object begins to exist is that in it which belongs to the changeable element in nature, the outward form and the properties depending upon mechanical or chemical combinations of its component parts. There is in every object another and a permanent element, viz., the specific elementary substance or substances of which it consists and their inherent properties. These are not known to us as beginning to exist; within the range of human knowledge they have no beginning, consequently no cause; though they themselves are causes or con-causes of everything that takes place. Experience, therefore, affords no evidences, not even analogies, to justify our extending to the apparently immutable a generalization grounded only on our observation of the changeable.

As a fact of experience, then, causation cannot legitimately be extended to the material universe itself, but only to its changeable phenomena; of these, indeed, causes may be affirmed without any exception. But what causes? The cause of every change is a prior change, and such it cannot but be, for if there were no new antecedent there would not be a new consequent. If the state of facts which brings the phenomenon into existence had existed always, or for any indefinite duration, the effect also would have existed always or been produced in indefinite time ago. It is thus a necessary part of the fact of causation, within the sphere of our experience, that the causes, as well as the effects, had a beginning in time and were themselves caused. It would seem, therefore, that our experience, instead of furnishing an argument for the first cause, is repugnant to it, and that the very essential of causation as it exists within the limits of our knowledge is incompatible with a first cause.”

The doctrine of the transmigration of soul or the reincarnation, is another grand idea of the Jain philosophy. Once the whole civilized world embraced this doctrine. Many philosophers have upheld it. Scientists like Flammarion, Figuier and Brewster have advocated it. Theologians like Müller, Dorner and Edward Beecher have maintained it.

The Bible and sacred literature of the East are full of it, and it is today accepted by the majority of the world's inhabitants.

People are talking of design in nature. But what does the idea of design lead to? Design means contrivance, adaptation of means to an end. But the necessity of contrivance, the need of employing means, is a consequence of the limitation of power. Who would have recourse to means if to attain this end his mere word was sufficient?

But how shall we reconcile God's infinite benevolence and justice with His infinite power, when we look around and see that some of His creatures are born happy and others miserable? Why is He so partial? Where is the moral responsibility of a person having no incentive to lead a virtuous life? The problem of injustice and misery which broods over our world can only be explained by the doctrine of reincarnation and Karma, to which I am presently coming.

That the soul is immortal is doubted by very few. It is an old declaration that whatever begins in time must end in time. You cannot say that soul is eternal on one side of its earthly period without being so in the other. If the soul sprang into existence specially for this life, why should it continue afterward? The ordinary idea of creation at birth involves the correlative of annihilation at death. Moreover, it does not stand to reason that from an infinite history the soul enters this world for its first and all physical existence, and then merges into an endless spiritual eternity. The more reasonable deduction is that it has passed through many lives and will have to pass through many more before it reaches its ultimate goal. But it is objected that we have no memory of past lives. Can anyone recall his childhood? Has anyone a memory of that wonderful epoch—infancy?

Passage of
the Soul.

The companion doctrine of transmigration is the doctrine of Karma. The Sanskrit of the word Karma means action. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," and "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" are but the corollaries of that most intricate law of Karman. It solves the problem of the inequality and apparent injustice of the world.

The Karman in the Jain philosophy is divided into eight classes: Those which act as an impediment to the knowledge of truth; those which act as an impediment to the right insight of various sorts; those which give one pleasure or pain, and those which produce bewilderment. The other four are again divided into other classes, so minutely, that a student of Jain Karman philosophy can trace any effect to a particular Karma. No other Indian philosophy reads so beautifully and so clearly the doctrine of Karmas. Persons who by right faith, right knowledge and right conduct destroy all Karman and thus fully develop the nature of their soul, reach the highest perfection, become divine and are called Jinas. Those Jinas who, in every age, preach the law and establish the order, are called Tirthankaras.

I now come to the Jain ethics. Different philosophers have given different bases for the guidance of conduct. The Jain ethics direct conduct to be so adapted as to insure the fullest development of the soul—

the highest happiness, that is, the goal of human conduct, which is the ultimate end of human action. Jainism teaches to look upon all living beings as upon oneself. What then is the mode of attaining the highest happiness? The sacred books of the Brahmins prescribe Upasana (devotion) and Karma. The Vedanta indicates the path of knowledge as the means to the highest. But Jainism goes a step farther and says that the highest happiness is to be obtained by knowledge and religious observances. The five Maharatas or great for Jain ascetics are:

Not to kill, *i. e.*, to protect all life. Not to lie. Not to take that which is not given. To abstain from sexual intercourse. To renounce all interest in worldly things, especially to call nothing one's own.





Mohammedan Mother and Children at the Door of the Mosque

Belief and Ceremonies of the Followers of Zoroaster.

Paper by JINANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, of India.



THE greatest good that a Parliament of Religions, like the present can do is to establish what Professor Max Müller calls "that great golden dawn of truth 'that there is a religion behind all religions'" The learned professor very rightly says that "Happy is the man who knows that truth in these days of materialism and atheism." If this Parliament of Religions does nothing else but spread the knowledge of this golden truth, and thus make a large number of men happy, it will immortalize its name. The object of my paper is to take a little part in the noble efforts of this great gathering, to spread the knowledge of that golden truth from a Parsee point of view. The Parsees of India are the followers of Zoroastrianism, of the religion of Zoroaster, a religion which was for centuries both the state religion and the national religion of ancient Persia. As Professor Max Müller says:

"There were periods in the history of the world when the worship of Ormuzd threatened to rise triumphant on the ruins of the temples of all other gods. If the battles of Marathon and Salamis had been lost and Greece had succumbed to Persia, the state religion of the empire of Cyrus, which was the worship of Ormuzd, might have become the religion of the whole civilized world. Persia had absorbed the Assyrian and Babylonian empires; Jews were either in Persian captivity or under Persian sway at home; the sacred monuments of Egypt had been mutilated by the hands of Persian soldiers. The edicts of the king—the king of kings—were sent to India, to Greece, to Scythia and to Egypt, and if 'by the grace of Ahura Mazda' Darius had crushed the liberty of Greece, the purer faith of Zoroaster might easily have superseded the Olympian fables."

Golden Truth
from a Parsee
Standpoint.

With the overthrow of the Persian monarchy under its last Sassanian king, Yazdagard, at the battle of Nehavand, in A. D. 642, the religion received a check at the hands of the Arabs, who, with sword in one hand and Koran in the other, made the religion of Islam both the state religion and national religion of the country. But many of those who adhered to the faith of their fathers quitted their ancient fatherland for the hospitable shores of India. The modern Parsees of India are the descendants of those early settlers. As a former governor of Bombay said, "Their position is unique—a handful of persons among the teeming millions of India, and yet who not only have preserved their ancient race with the utmost purity, but also their religion absolutely unimpaired by contact with others."

Unimpaired
by Contact.

In the words of Rt. Rev. Dr. Meurin, the learned bishop (vicar apostolic) of Bombay, in 1885, the Parsees are "a people who have chosen to relinquish their venerable ancestors' homesteads rather than abandon their ancient religion, the founder of which lived no less than 3,000 years ago, a people who for a thousand years have formed in the midst of the great Hindu people, not unlike an island in the sea, a quite separate and distinct nation, peculiar and remarkable as for its race, so for its religious and social life and customs." Prof. Max Müller says of the religion of the Parsees:

"Though every religion is of real and vital interest in its earliest state only, yet its later development, too, with all its misunderstandings, faults and corruptions, offers many an instructive lesson to the thoughtful student of history. Here is a religion, one of the most ancient of the world, once the state religion of the most powerful empire, driven away from its native soil and deprived of political influence, without even the prestige of a powerful or enlightened priesthood, and yet professed by a handful of exiles—men of wealth, intelligence and moral worth in western India—with unhesitating fervor such as is seldom to be found in larger religious communities. It is well worth the earnest endeavor of the philosopher and the divine to discover, if possible, the spell by which this apparently effete religion continues to command the attachment of the enlightened Parsees of India and makes them turn a deaf ear to the allurements of the Brahmanic worship and the earnest appeals of Christian missionaries."

Zoroastrianism or Parseeism, by whatever name the system may be called, is a monotheistic form of religion. It believes in the existence of one God, whom it knows under the names of Mazda, Ahura and Ahura-Mazda, the last form being the one that is most commonly met with in the latter writings of the Avesta. The first and the greatest truth that dawns upon the mind of a Zoroastrian is that the great and the infinite universe, of which he is an infinitesimally small part, is the work of a powerful hand—the result of a master mind. The first and the greatest conception of that master mind, Ahura-Mazda, is that, as the name implies, he is the Omniscient Lord, and as such He is the ruler of both the material and the immaterial world, the corporeal and the incorporeal world, the visible and the invisible world. The regu-

mony and
er Pre-
d.

lar movements of the sun and the stars, the periodical waxing and waning of the moon, the regular way in which the sun and the clouds are sustained, the regular flow of waters and the gradual growth of vegetation, the rapid movements of the winds and the regular succession of light and darkness, of day and night, with their accompaniments of sleep and wakefulness, all these grand and striking phenomena of nature point to and bear ample evidence of the existence of an almighty power who is not only the creator, but the preserver of this great universe, who has not only launched that universe into existence with a premeditated plan of completeness, but who, with the controlling hand of a father, preserves by certain fixed laws harmony and order here, there and everywhere.

As Ahura-Mazda is the ruler of the physical world, so He is the ruler of the spiritual world. His distinguished attributes are good mind, righteousness, desirable control, piety, perfection and immortality. He is the Beneficent Spirit from whom emanate all good and all piety. He looks into the hearts of men and sees how much of the good and of the piety that have emanated from Him has made its home there, and thus rewards the virtuous and punishes the vicious. Of course, one sees at times, in the plane of this world, moral disorders and want of harmony, but then the present state is only a part, and that a very small part, of His scheme of moral government. As the ruler of the world, Ahura-Mazda hears the prayers of the ruled. He grants the prayers of those who are pious in thoughts, pious in words and pious in deeds. "He not only rewards the good, but punishes the wicked. All that is created, good or evil, fortune or misfortune, is His work."

We have seen that Ahura-Mazda, or God, is, according to Parsee Scriptures, the causer of all causes. He is the creator as well as the destroyer, the increaser as well as the decreaser. He gives birth to different creatures and it is He who brings about their end. How is it, then, that He brings about these two contrary results? In the words of Dr. Haug:

Great Prob-
n Solved.

"Having arrived at the grand idea of the unity and indivisibility of the Supreme Being, he (Zoroaster) undertook to solve the great problem which has engaged the attention of so many wise men of antiquity and even of modern times, viz: How are the imperfections discoverable in the world, the various kinds of evils, wickedness and baseness, compatible with the goodness, holiness and justice of God? This great thinker of remote antiquity solved this difficult question philosophically by the supposition of two primeval causes, which, though different, were united and produced the world of material things, as well as that of the spirit."

These two primeval causes or principles are called in the Avesta the two "Mainyus." This word comes from the ancient Aryan root "man," to "think." It may be properly rendered into English by the word "spirit," meaning "that which can only be conceived by the mind but not felt by the senses." Of these two spirits or primeval causes or

principles, one is creative and the other destructive. These two spirits work under the Almighty day and night. They create and destroy, and this they have done ever since the world was created. According to Zoroaster's philosophy, our world is the work of these two hostile principles—Spenta-mainyush, the good principle, and Angro-mainyush, the evil principle, both serving under one God. In the words of that learned orientalist, Professor Darmesteter, "All that is good in the world comes from the former; all that is bad in it comes from the latter. The history of the world is the history of their conflict; how Angra-mainyu invaded the world of Ahura-Mazda and marred it, and how he shall be expelled from it at last. Man is active in the conflict, his duty in it being laid before him in the law revealed by Ahura Mazda to Zarathushtra. When the appointed time is come * * * Angra-mainyu and hell will be destroyed, men will rise from the dead, and everlasting happiness will reign over the world.'

These philosophical notions have led some learned men to misunderstand Zoroastrian theology. Some authors entertain an opinion that Zoroaster preached dualism. But this is a serious misconception. In the Parsee scriptures the names of God are Mazda, Ahura and Ahura-Mazda, the last word being a compound of the first two. The first two words are common in the earliest writings of the Gâthâ and the third in the later scriptures. In later times the word Ahura-Mazda, instead of being restricted, like Mazda, the name of God began to be used in a wider sense, and was applied to Spenta-mainyush, the creative or the good principle. This being the case, wherever the word Ahura-Mazda was used in opposition to that of Angra-mainyush, later authors took it as the name of God, and not as the name of the creative principle, which it really was. Thus the very fact of Ahura-Mazda's name being employed in opposition to that of Angra-mainyush or Ahriman led to the notion that Zoroastrian scriptures preached dualism.

Its Theology
Misunder-
stood.

Not only is the charge of dualism as leveled against Zoroastrianism, and as ordinarily understood, groundless, but there is a close resemblance between the ideas of the devil among the Christians and those of the Ahriman among the Zoroastrians. Dr. Haug says the same thing in the following words:

"The Zoroastrian idea of the devil and the infernal kingdom coincides entirely with the Christian doctrine. The devil is a murderer and father of lies, according to both the Bible and the Zend Avesta."

Thus we see that, according to Zoroaster's philosophy, there are two primeval principles that produce our material world. Consequently, though the Almighty is the creator of all, a part of the creation is said to be created by the good principle and a part by the evil principle. Thus, for example, the heavenly bodies, the earth, water, fire, horses, dogs and such other objects are the creation of the good principle, and serpents, ants, locusts, etc., are the creation of the evil principle. In short, those things that conduce to the greatest good of the greatest number of mankind fall under the category of the

creations of the good principle, and those that lead to the contrary result, under that of the creations of the evil principle. This being the case, it is incumbent upon men to do actions that would support the cause of the good principle and destroy that of the evil one. Therefore, the cultivation of the soil, the rearing of domestic animals, etc., on the one hand and the destruction of wild animals and other noxious creatures on the other, are considered meritorious actions by the Parsees.

As there are two primeval principles under Ahura-Mazda that produce our material world, so there are two principles inherent in the nature of man which encourage him to do good or tempt him to do evil. One asks him to support the cause of the good principle, the other to support that of the evil principle. The first is known by the name of Vohumana or Behemana, *i. e.*, "good mind." The prefix "vohu" or "bel." is the same word as that of which our English "better" is the comparative. Mana is the same as the word "maniyu," and means mind or spirit. The second is known by the name of Akamana, *i. e.*, "bad mind." The prefix "aka" means "bad" and is the same as our English word "ache" in "headache."

Now the fifth chapter of the Vendidad gives, as it were, a short definition of what is morality or piety. There, first of all, the writer says: "Purity is the best thing for man after birth." This, you may say, is the motto of the Zoroastrian religion. Therefore, M. Harlez very properly says that, according to Zoroastrian scriptures, the "notion of the word virtue sums itself up in that of the 'Ashā.'" This word is the same as the Sanskrit "rita," which word corresponds to our English "right." It means, therefore, righteousness, piety or purity. Then the writer proceeds to give a short definition of piety. It says that, "the preservation of good thoughts, good words and good deeds is piety." In these pithy words is summed up, so to say, the whole of the moral philosophy of the Zoroastrian scriptures. It says that, if you want to lead a pious and moral life and thus to show a clean bill of spiritual health to the angel, Meher Daver, who watches the gates of heaven at the Chinvat bridge, practice these three: Think of nothing but the truth, speak nothing but the truth, and do nothing but what is proper. In short, what Zoroastrian moral philosophy teaches is this—that your good thoughts, good deeds and good words alone will be your intercessors. Nothing more will be wanted. They alone will serve you as a safe pilot to the harbor of heaven, as a safe guide to the gates of paradise. The late Dr. Haug rightly observed that "the moral philosophy of Zoroaster was moving in the triad of 'thought, word and deed.'" These three words form, as it were, the pivot upon which the moral structure of Zoroastrianism turns. It is the groundwork upon which the whole edifice of Zoroastrian morality rests.

The following dialogue in the Pehelvi Padnameh of Buzurge-Meher shows in a succinct form what weight is attached to these three pithy words in the moral code of the Zoroastrians:

Question. Who is the most fortunate man in the world?

Safe Pilot to
the Harbor of
Heaven.

Answer. He who is the most innocent.

Question. Who is the most innocent man in the world?

Answer. He who walks in the path of God and shuns that of the devil.

Question. Which is the path of God, and which that of the devil?

Answer. Virtue is the path of God, and vice that of the devil.

Moral Code.

Question. What constitutes virtue, and what vice?

Answer. (Humata, hukhta and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words and good deeds constitute virtue, and (dushmata, duzukhta and duzvarshta) evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds constitute vice.

Question. What constitute (humata, hukhta and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words and good deeds, and (dushmata, duzukhta and duzvarshta) evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds?

Answer. Honesty, charity and truthfulness constitute the former, and dishonesty, want of charity and falsehood constitute the latter.

From this dialogue it will be seen that a man who acquires (humata, hukhta and hvarshta) good thoughts, good words and good deeds, and thereby practices honesty, charity and truthfulness, is considered to walk in the path of God, and, therefore, to be the most innocent and fortunate man.

Herodotus also refers to the third cardinal virtue of truthfulness mentioned above. He says that to speak the truth was one of the three things taught to a Zoroastrian of his time from his very childhood.

Zoroastrianism believes in the immortality of the soul. The Avesta writings of Hadokht Nushk, and the nineteenth chapter of the Vendidad, and of the Pehelvi books of Minokherad and Viraf-nameh, treat of the fate of the soul after death. Its notions about heaven and hell correspond, to some extent, to the Christian notions about them. A plant called the Homa-i-saphid, or white Homa, a name corresponding to the Indian Soma of the Hindus, is held to be the emblem of the immortality of the soul. According to Dr. Windischmann and Prof. Max Müller, this plant reminds us of the "Tree of Life" in the garden of Eden. As in the Christian scriptures the way to the tree of life is strictly guarded by the Cherubim, so in the Zoroastrian scriptures the Homa-i-saphid, or the plant which is the emblem of immortality, is guarded by innumerable Fravashis, that is, guardian spirits. The number of these guardian spirits, as given in various books, is 99,999.

Again, Zoroastrianism believes in heaven and hell. Heaven is called Vahishta-ahu in the Avesta books. It literally means the "best life." This word is afterward contracted, with a slight change, into the Persian word "Behesht," which is the superlative form of "Veh," meaning "good," and corresponds exactly with our English word "best." Hell is known by the name of "Achishta-ahu." Heaven is represented as a place of radiance, splendor and glory, and hell as that of gloom, darkness and stench. Between heaven and this world there is supposed to be a bridge, named "Chinvat." This word—from the

Believes in
Heaven and
Hell.

Aryan root "chi," meaning to pick up, to collect—means the place where a man's soul has to present a collective account of the actions done in the past life.


According to the Parsee scriptures, for three days after a man's death his soul remains within the limits of the world under the guidance of the angel Srosh. If the deceased be a pious man, or a man who led a virtuous life, his soul utters the words "Ushta-ahmai yahmai ushta-kahmai-chit," *i. e.*, "Well is he by whom that which is his benefit becomes the benefit of any one else." If he be a wicked man, or one who led an evil life, his soul utters these plaintive words: "Kam nemoi zam? Kuthra nemo ayeni? *i. e.*, "To which land shall I turn? Whither shall I go?"

On the dawn of the third night the departed souls appear at the "Chinvat bridge." This bridge is guarded by the angel Meher Daver, *i. e.*, Meher, the judge. He presides there as a judge, assisted by the angels Rashne and Astad, the former representing justice and the latter truth. At this bridge, and before this angel Meher, the soul of every man has to give an account of its doings in the past life. Meher Daver, the judge, weighs a man's actions by a scale-pan. If a man's good actions outweigh his evil ones, even by a small particle, he is allowed to pass from the bridge to the other end to heaven. If his evil actions outweigh his good ones, even by a small weight, he is not allowed to pass over the bridge, but is hurled down into the deep abyss of hell. If his meritorious and evil deeds counterbalance each other, he is sent to a place known as "hamast-gehan," corresponding to the Christian "purgatory" and the Mohammedan "acraf." His meritorious deeds done in the past life would prevent him from going to hell, and his evil actions would not let him go to heaven.

What the
Books Say.

Again, Zoroastrian books say that the meritoriousness of good deeds and the sin of evil ones increase with the growth of time. As capital increases with interest, so good and bad actions done by a man in his life increase, as it were, with interest in their effects. Thus, a meritorious deed done in young age is more effective than that very deed done in advanced age. A man must begin practicing virtue from his very young age. As in the case of good deeds and their meritoriousness, so in the case of evil actions and their sins. The burden of the sin of an evil action increases, as it were, with interest. A young man has a long time to repent of his evil deeds and to do good deeds that could counteract the effect of his evil deeds. If he does not take advantage of these opportunities the burden of those evil deeds increases with time.

The Parsee places of worship are known as fire temples. The very name fire temple would strike a non-Zoroastrian as an unusual form of worship. The Parsees do not worship fire as God. They merely regard fire as an emblem of refulgence, glory and light as the most perfect symbol of God, and as the best and noblest representative of His divinity. "In the eyes of a Parsee his (fire's) brightness, activity, purity and incorruptibility bear the most perfect resemblance to the



nature and perfection of the Deity." A Parsee looks upon fire "as the most perfect symbol of the Deity on account of its purity, brightness, activity, subtilty, purity and incorruptibility."

Again, one must remember that it is the several symbolic ceremonies that add to the reverence entertained by a Parsee for the fire burning in his fire temples. A new element of purity is added to the fire burning in the fire temples of the Parsees by the religious ceremonies accompanied with prayers that are performed over it, before it is installed in its place on a vase on an exalted stand in a chamber set apart. The sacred fire burning there is not the ordinary fire burning in our hearths. It has undergone several ceremonies, and it is these ceremonies, full of meaning, that render the fire more sacred in the eyes of a Parsee. We will briefly recount the process here:

In establishing a fire temple fires from various places of manufacture are brought and kept in different vases. Great efforts are also made to obtain fire caused by lightning. Over one of these fires a perforated metallic flat tray with a handle attached is held. On this tray are placed small chips and dust of fragrant sandalwood. These chips and dust are ignited by the heat of the fire below, care being taken that the perforated tray does not touch the fire. Thus a new fire is created out of the first fire. Then from this new fire another is again produced, and so on, until the process is repeated nine times. The fire thus prepared after the ninth process is considered pure. The fires brought from other places of manufacture are treated in a similar manner. These purified fires are all collected together upon a large vase, which is then put in its proper place in a separate chamber.

Fire Temples.

Now what does a fire so prepared signify to a Parsee? He thinks to himself: "When this fire on this vase before me, though pure in itself, though the noblest of the creations of God, and though the best symbol of the Divinity, had to undergo certain processes of purification, had to draw out, as it were, its essence—nay, its quintessence—of purity to enable itself to be worthy of occupying this exalted position, how much more necessary, more essential and more important it is for me—a poor mortal who is liable to commit sins and crimes, and who comes into contact with hundreds of evils, both physical and mental—to undergo the process of purity and piety by making my thoughts, words and actions pass, as it were, through a sieve of piety and purity, virtue and morality, and to separate by that means my good thoughts, good words and good actions from bad thoughts, bad words and bad actions, so that I may, in my turn, be enabled to acquire an exalted position in the next world."

Again, the fires put together as above are collected from the houses of men of different grades in society. This reminds a Parsee that, as all these fires from the houses of men of different grades have all, by the process of purification, equally acquired the exalted place in the vase, so before God, all men, no matter to what grades of society they belong, are equal, provided they pass through the pro-

cess of purification, *i. e.*, provided they preserve purity of thoughts, purity of words and purity of deeds.

Dust to Dust.

Again, when a Parsee goes before the sacred fire, which is kept all day and night burning in the fire temple, the officiating priest presents before him the ashes of a part of the consumed fire. The Parsee applies it to his forehead just as a Christian applies the consecrated water in his church and thinks to himself: "Dust to dust. The fire, all brilliant, shining and resplendent, has spread the fragrance of the sweet-smelling sandal and frankincense round about, but is at last reduced to dust. So it is destined for me. After all I am to be reduced to dust and have to depart from this transient life. Let me do my best to spread, like this fire, before my death, the fragrance of charity and good deeds, and lead the light of righteousness and knowledge before others."

In short, the sacred fire burning in a fire temple serves as a perpetual monitor to a Parsee standing before it to preserve piety, purity, humility and brotherhood.

As we said above, evidence from nature is the surest evidence that leads a Parsee to the belief in the existence of the Deity. From nature he is led to nature's God. From this point of view, then, he is not restricted to any particular place for the recital of his prayers. For a visitor to Bombay, which is the headquarters of the Parsees, it is therefore not unusual to see a number of Parsees saying their prayers, morning and evening, in the open space, turning their faces to the rising or the setting sun, before the glowing moon or the foaming sea. Turning to these grand objects, the best and sublimest of his creations, they address their prayers to the Almighty.

Parsee Prayers.

All Parsee prayers begin with an assurance to do acts that would please the Almighty God. The assurance is followed by an expression of regret for past evil thoughts, words or deeds if any. Man is liable to err, and so, if during the interval any errors of commission or omission are committed, a Parsee in the beginning of his prayers repents for those errors. He says:

O, Omniscient Lord! I repent of all my sins. I repent of all evil thoughts that I might have entertained in my mind, of all the evil words that I might have spoken, of all the evil actions that I might have committed. O, Omniscient Lord! I repent of all the faults that might have originated with me, whether they refer to thoughts, words or deeds, whether they appertain to my body or soul, whether they be in connection with the material world or spiritual.

To educate their children is a spiritual duty of Zoroastrian parents. Education is necessary, not only for the material good of the children and the parents, but also for their spiritual good. According to the Parsee books, the parents participate in the meritoriousness of the good acts performed by their children as the result of the good education imparted to them. On the other hand, if the parents neglect the education of their children, and if, as the result of this neglect, they do wrongful acts or evil deeds, the parents have a spirit-

ual responsibility for such acts. In proportion to the malignity or evilness of these acts the parents are responsible to God for their neglect of the education of their children. It is, as it were, a spiritual self-interest that must prompt a Parsee to look to the good education of his children at an early age. Thus, from a religious point of view, education is a great question with the Parsees.

The proper age recommended by religious Parsee books for ordinary education is seven. Before that age children should have home education with their parents, especially with the mother. At the age of seven, after a little religious education, a Parsee child is invested with *Sudreh* and *Kusti*, *i. e.*, the sacred shirt and thread. This ceremony of investiture corresponds to the confirmation ceremony of the Christians. A Parsee may put on the dress of any nationality he likes, but under that dress he must always wear the sacred shirt and thread. These are the symbols of his being a Zoroastrian. These symbols are full of meaning and act as perpetual monitors advising the wearer to lead a life of purity—of physical and spiritual purity. A Parsee is enjoined to remove, and put on again immediately, the sacred thread several times during the day, saying a very short prayer during the process. He has to do so early in the morning on rising from bed, before meals and after ablutions. The putting on of the symbolic thread and the accompanying short prayer remind him to be in a state of repentance for misdeeds, if any, and to preserve good thoughts, good words and good deeds, the triad in which the moral philosophy of Zoroaster moved.

It is after this investiture with the sacred shirt and thread that the general education of a child generally begins. The Parsee books speak of the necessity of educating all children, whether male or female. Thus female education claims as much attention among the Parsees as male education. Physical education is as much spoken of in the Zoroastrian books as mental and moral education. The health of the body is considered as the first requisite for the health of the soul. That the physical education of the ancient Persians, the ancestors of the modern Parsees, was a subject of admiration among the ancient Greeks and Romans, is too well known. In all the blessings invoked upon one in the religious prayers, the strength of body occupies the first and the most prominent place. Analyzing the Bombay census of 1881, Dr. Weir, the health officer, said:

"Examining education according to faith or class, we find that education is most extended among the Parsee people; female education is more diffused among the Parsee population than any other class. * * * Contrasting these results with education at an early age among Parsees, we find 12.2 per cent Parsee male and 8.84 per cent female children under six years of age, under instruction; between six and fifteen the number of Parsee male and female children under instruction is much larger than in any other class. Over fifteen years of age, the smallest proportion of illiterate, either male or female, is found in the Parsee population."

When General Education Begins.

The religious books of the Parsees say that the education of Zoroastrian youths should teach them perfect discipline, obedience to their teachers, obedience to their parents, obedience to their elders in society, and obedience to the constitutional forms of government should be one of the practical results of their education. So a Zoroastrian child is asked to be affectionate toward and submissive to his teachers. A Parsee mother prays for a son that could take an intelligent part in the deliberations of the councils of his community and government; so a regard for the regular forms of government was necessary.

Of all the practical questions, the one most affected by the religious precepts of Zoroastrianism is that of the observation of sanitary rules and principles. Several chapters of the Vendidad form, as it were, the sanitary code of the Parsees. Most of the injunctions will stand the test of sanitary science for ages together. Of the different Asiatic communities inhabiting Bombay, the Parsees have the lowest death rate. One can safely say that that is, to a great extent, due to the Zoroastrian ideas of sanitation, segregation, purification and cleanliness. A Parsee is enjoined not to drink from the same cup or glass from which another man has drunk, lest he catch by contagion the disease from which the other may be suffering. He is, under no circumstances, to touch the body of a person a short time after death, lest he spread the disease, if contagious, of the deceased. If he accidentally or unavoidably does, he has to purify himself by a certain process of washing before he mixes with others in society. A passing fly, or even a blowing wind, is supposed to spread disease by contagion. So he is enjoined to perform ablutions several times during the day, as before saying his prayers, before meals, and after answering the calls of nature. If his hand comes into contact with the saliva of his own mouth or with that of somebody else, he has to wash it. He has to keep himself aloof from corpse-bearers, lest he spread any disease through them. If accidentally he comes into contact with these people, he has to bathe himself before mixing in society. A breach of these and various other sanitary rules is, as it were, helping the cause of the evil principle.

Sanitary
Rules and Prin-
ciples.

Again, Zoroastrianism asks its disciples to keep the earth pure, to keep the air pure, and to keep the water pure. It considers the sun as the greatest purifier. In places where the rays of the sun do not enter, fire over which fragrant wood is burned is the next purifier. It is a great sin to pollute water by decomposing matter. Not only is the commission of a fault of this kind a sin, but also the omission, when one sees such a pollution, of taking proper means to remove it. A Zoroastrian, when he happens to see, while passing in his way, a running stream of drinking water polluted by some decomposing matter, such as a corpse, is enjoined to wait and try his best to go into the stream and to remove the putrifying matter, lest its continuation may spoil the water and affect the health of the people using it. An omission to do this act is a sin from a Zoroastrian point of view. At the bottom of a Parsee's custom of disposing of the dead, and at the

bottom of all the strict religious ceremonies enjoined therewith, lies the one main principle, viz., that, preserving all possible respect for the dead, the body, after its separation from the immortal soul, should be disposed of in a way the least harmful and the least injurious to the living. The homely proverb of "cleanliness is godliness" is nowhere more recommended than in the Parsee religious books, which teach that the cleanliness of body will lead to and help the cleanliness of mind.

We now come to the question of wealth, poverty and labor. As Herodotus said, a Parsee, before praying for himself, prays for his sovereign and for his community, for he is himself included in the community. His religious precepts teach him to drown his individuality in the common interests of his community. He is to consider himself as a part and parcel of the whole community. The good of the whole will be the good—and that a solid good—of the parts. In the twelfth chapter of the Yasna, which contains, as it were, Zoroastrian articles of faith, a Zoroastrian promises to preserve a perfect brotherhood. He promises, even at the risk of his life, to protect the life and the property of all the members of his community and to help in the cause that would bring about their prosperity and welfare. It is with these good feelings of brotherhood and charity that the Parsee community has endowed large funds for benevolent and charitable purposes. If the rich Parsees of the future generations were to follow in the footsteps of their ancestors of the past and present generations in the matter of giving liberal donations for the good of the deserving poor of their community, one can say that there would be very little cause for the socialists to complain from a poor man's point of view. It is these notions of charity and brotherhood that have urged them to start public funds for the general good of the whole community. Men of all grades in society contribute to these funds on various occasions. The rich contribute on occasions both of joy and grief. On grand occasions, like those of weddings in their families, they contribute large sums in charity to commemorate those events. Again, on the death of their dear ones, the rich and the poor all pay various sums, according to their means, in charity. These sums are announced on the occasion of the Oothumna, or the ceremony on the third day after death. The rich pay large sums on these occasions to commemorate the names of their dear ones. In the Vendidad three kinds of charitable deeds are especially mentioned as meritorious—to help the poor; to help a man to marry, and thus to enable him to lead a virtuous and honorable life, and to give education to those who are in search of it. If one were to look to the long list of Parsee charities, headed by that of that prince of Parsee charity, the first Parsee baronet, he will find these three kinds of charity especially attended to. The religious training of a Parsee does not restrict his ideas of brotherhood and charity to his own community alone. He extends his charity to non-Zoroastrians as well.

Wealth, Poverty and Labor.

The qualifications of a good husband, from a Zoroastrian point

Qualifica-
tions of a Good
Husband.

of view, are that he must be (1) young and handsome; (2) strong, brave and healthy; (3) diligent and industrious, so as to maintain his wife and children; (4) truthful, as would prove true to herself, and true to all others with whom he would come in contact, and is wise and educated. A wise, intelligent and educated husband is compared to a fertile piece of land which gives a plentiful crop, whatever kind of seeds are sown in it. The qualifications of a good wife are that she be wise and educated, modest and courteous, obedient and chaste. Obedience to her husband is the first duty of a Zoroastrian wife. It is a great virtue, deserving all praise and reward. Disobedience is a great sin, punishable after death.

According to the Sad-dar, a wife that expressed a desire to her husband three times a day—in the morning, afternoon and evening—to be one with him in thoughts, words and deeds, *i. e.*, to sympathize with him in all his noble aspirations, pursuits and desires, performed as meritorious an act as that of saying her prayers three times a day. She must wish to be of the same view with him in all his noble pursuits and ask him every day: "What are your thoughts, so that I may be one with you in those thoughts? What are your words, so that I may be one with you in your speech? What are your deeds, so that I may be one with you in deeds?" A Zoroastrian wife so affectionate and obedient to her husband was held in great respect, not only by the husband and the household, but in society as well. As Dr. West says, though a Zoroastrian wife was asked to be very obedient to her husband, she held a more respectable position in society than that enjoined by any other Oriental religion. As Sir John Malcolm says, the ordinance of Zoroaster secured for Zoroastrian women an equal rank with the male creation. The progress of the ancient Persians in civilization was partly due to this cause. "The great respect in which the female sex was held was, no doubt, the principal cause of the progress they had made in civilization. These were at once the cause of generous enterprise and its reward." The advance of the modern Parsis, the descendants of the ancient Persians, in the path of civilization is greatly due to this cause. As Dr. Haug says, the religious books of the Parsis hold women on a level with men. "They are always mentioned as a necessary part of the religious community. They have the same religious rites as men; the spirits of deceased women are invoked as well as those of men." Parsee books attach as much importance to female education as to male education.

Marriage is an institution which is greatly encouraged by the spirit of the Parsee religion. It is especially recommended in the Parsee scriptures on the ground that a married life is more likely to be happy than an unmarried one; that a married person is more likely to be able to withstand physical and mental afflictions than an unmarried person, and that a married man is more likely to lead a religious and virtuous life than an unmarried one. The following verse in the Gatha conveys this meaning:

"I say (these) words to you marrying brides and to you bride-

grooms. Impress them in your mind. May you two enjoy the life of good mind by following the laws of religion. Let each one of you clothe the other with righteousness, because then assuredly there will be a happy life for you."

An unmarried person is represented to feel as unhappy as a fertile piece of ground that is carelessly allowed to lie uncultivated by its owner (Vend. iii., 24). The fertile piece, when cultivated, not only adds to the beauty of the spot, but lends nourishment and food to many others round about. So a married couple not only add to their own beauty, grace and happiness, but by their righteousness and good conduct are in a position to spread the blessings of help and happiness among their neighbors. Marriage being thus considered a good institution, and being recommended by the religious scriptures, it is considered a very meritorious act for a Parsee to help his co-religionists to lead a married life (Vend. iv, 44). Several rich Parsees have, with this charitable view, founded endowment funds, from which young deserving brides are given small sums on the occasion of their marriage for the preliminary expenses of starting in married life.

Marriage a
Good Institu-
tion.

Fifteen is the minimum marriageable age spoken of by the Parsee books. The parents have a voice of sanction or approval in the selection of wives and husbands. Mutual friends of parents or marrying parties may bring about a good selection. Marriages with non-Zoroastrians are not recommended, as they are likely to bring about quarrels and dissensions owing to a difference of manners, customs and habits.

We said above that the Parsee religion has made its disciples tolerant about the faiths and beliefs of others. It has as well made them sociable with the other sister communities of the country. They mix freely with members of other faiths and take a part in the rejoicings of their holidays. They also sympathize with them in their griefs and afflictions, and in case of sudden calamities, such as fire, floods, etc., they subscribe liberally to alleviate their misery. From a consideration of all kinds of moral and charitable notions inculcated in the Zoroastrian scriptures, Frances Power Cobbe, in her "Studies, New and Old, of Ethical and Social Subjects," says of the founder of the religion:

Had Zoroast-
or Never Ex-
isted.

"Should we in a future world be permitted to hold high converse with the great departed, it may chance that in the Bactrian sage, who lived and taught almost before the dawn of history, we may find the spiritual patriarch, to whose lessons we have owed such a portion of our intellectual inheritance that we might hardly conceive what human belief would be now, had Zoroaster never existed."



Mohammedans of Damascus.

Spirit and Mission of the Apostolic Church of Armenia.

Paper by OHANNES CHATSCHUMGAN, of Armenia.



CCORDING to the general testimony of historians, Christianity was introduced into Armenia in the first century. In the year 34 A. D. the Apostle Thaddeus went to this country, and in the year 60 A. D. Bartholomew followed. They preached the Gospel and were martyred. These apostles were, therefore, the founders of the Armenian church. Besides them two others, Simeon and Judah, preached in Armenia. But Christianity did not become the established religion until the year 302 A. D., although during this interval thousands of Armenians became martyrs for Christianity. In that year Saint Gregory Illuminator enlightened the entire Armenian nation, and Christianity became the religion of the king as well as of the people. In the Armenian language to "enlighten" means to "Christianize." Whether, therefore, we date the establishment of Christianity from the first century or at the beginning of the fourth, the Armenian church remains the oldest Christian church in the world.

Oldest Christian Church in the World.

Because of its past it has a peculiar place among other churches. While the church is only one element in the lives of other nations—an element sometimes strong, sometimes less strong—in Armenia it embraces the whole life of the nation. There are not two different ideals, one for Christianity, the other for nationality. These two ideals are united. The Armenians love their country because they love Christianity. Church and fatherland have been almost synonymous in their tongues.

The construction of the Armenian church is simple and apostolic. It is independent and national. The head is called the Patriarch Catholicos of all Armenians in whatever part of the world they may be. He is elected by the representatives of the nation and clergy

in Etchmiadzin, at the foot of Mount Ararat. Any Armenian, even a layman, can become head of the church if the general assembly finds him worthy of this high office. Since Armenia has been divided among the three powers—Turkey, Russia and Persia—the election of the Catholicos is confirmed by the Russian emperor. The bishops are elected by the people of each province and are anointed by the Catholicos. The ordinary clergy are elected by each parish. The parish is free in its election, and neither bishop nor Catholicos can assign a priest to a parish against its wish. Each church being free in its home work, they are all bound with one another and so form a unity.

The people share largely in the work of the church. All assemblies which have to decide general questions, even dogmatic matters, are gathered from both people and clergy. The clergy exists for the people and not the people for the clergy.

The Armeni-
an Clergy.

The Armenian clergy have always been pioneers in the educational advancement of the nation. They have been the bringers in of European civilization to their people. From the fifth century to this very day young men intended for the priesthood are sent to the Occident to study in order that Christianity and civilization may go hand in hand. The country owes everything to its clergy. They have been first in danger and first in civilization.

The spirit of the Armenian church is tolerant. A characteristic feature of Armenians, even while they were heathen, was that they were cosmopolitan in religious matters. Armenia, in early ages, was an America for the oppressed of other lands. From Assyria, as we read in the Bible, in the Book of Kings, Adramelech and Anamelech escaped to Armenia. From China, Hindustan and Palestine they went thither, carrying their religious thoughts and their idols, which they worshiped side by side with the Armenian gods.

Christianity has entirely changed the political and moral life of Armenia, but the tolerant spirit has ever remained. For more than fifteen hundred years she has been persecuted for her faith and for conscience' sake, and yet she has never been a religious persecutor. She calls no church heterodox. The last Catholicos, Makar the First, said once to me: "My son, do not call any church heterodox. All churches are equal, and everybody is saved by his own faith." Every day in our churches prayers are offered for all those who call on the name of The Most High in sincerity.

The Armenian church does not like religious disputes. She has defended the ideals of Christianity more with the red blood of her children than with big volumes of controversies. She has always insisted on the brotherhood of all Christians. Nerces, archbishop of Zanzibar, Cilicia, who was called the second Apostle Paul, in the twelfth century defended and practiced the very ideals and equality of all churches and the brotherhood of all men which the most liberal clergymen of this century believe in.

The Armenian church has a great literature, especially in sacred


lyrics, which has had a vast influence over the people. But the purifying influence of our church appears chiefly in the family. In no land is the family life purer. For an Armenian the family is sacred. Ethnologists ask with reason: "How can we explain the continued existence of the Armenian nation through the fire and sword of four thousand years?" The solution of this riddle is in the pure family life. This is the anchor by which the stormbeaten has been held. It is a singular fact that Armenia never had, even in her heathen time, either polygamy or slavery, although always surrounded by nations who followed these evil practices.

Women in Armenia have always had a distinguished place in the church. The first Christian martyr among women in the whole world was an Armenian girl, Sandoct, the beautiful daughter of the King Sanstreek. In the fifth century, as says the historian, Equishe, the songs of the Armenian women were the psalms and their daily readings the Gospel.

Women in
Armenia.

Geographically, Armenia is the bridge between Asia and Europe. All the nations of Asia have traveled over this bridge. One cannot show a single year in the long past through which she has enjoyed peace. Every one of her stones has been baptized many times with the sacred blood of martyrs. Her rivers have flowed, not with water, but with blood and tears of the Armenian nation. Surrounded by non-Christian and anti-Christian peoples, she has kept her Christianity and her independent national church. Through the darkness of the ages she has been a bright torch in the Orient of Christianity and civilization.

All her neighbors have passed away—the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Parthians, and the Persian fire worshipers. Armenia, herself, has lost everything; crown and scepter are gone; peace and happiness have departed; to her remains only the cross, the sign of martyrdom. Yet the Armenian church still lives. Why? To fulfill the work she was called to do; to spread civilization among the peoples of this part of Asia, and she has still vitality enough to fulfill this mission. For this struggling and aspiring church we crave your sympathy. To help the Armenian church is to help humanity.





Bedouin Sheik (Mohammedan).

Prize Essay on Confucianism.

By KUNG HSIEN HO, of Shanghai, China.



THE most important thing in the superior man's learning is to fear disobeying heaven's will. Therefore in our Confucian religion the most important thing is to follow the will of heaven. The book of Yih King says, "In the changes of the world there is a great Supreme which produces two principles, and these two principles are Yin and Yang. By Supreme is meant the spring of all activity. Our sages regard Yin and Yang and the five elements as acting and reacting on each other without ceasing, and this doctrine is all important, like as the hinge of a door.

The incessant production of all things depends on this, as the tree does on the root. Even all human affairs and all good are also dependent on it; therefore, it is called the Supreme, just as we speak of the extreme points of the earth as the north and south poles.

By Great Supreme is meant that there is nothing above it. But heaven is without sound or smell, therefore, the ancients spoke of the infinite and the great supreme. The great supreme producing Yin and Yang is law-producing forces. When Yang and Yin unite they produce water, fire, wood, metal, earth. When these five forces operate in harmony the four seasons come to pass. The essences of the infinite, of Yin and Yang, and of the five elements combine, and the heavenly become male, and the earthly become female. When these powers act on each other all things are produced and reproduced and developed without end.

As to man, he is the best and most intelligent of all. This is what is meant in the book of Chung Yung when it says that what heaven has given is the spiritual nature. This nature is law. All men are thus born and have this law. Therefore it is Mencius says that all children love the parents, and when grown up all respect their elder brethren. If men only followed the natural bent of this nature, then all would go the right way; hence, the Chung Yung says, "To follow nature is the right way."

Spiritual Nature is Law.

The Material
Nature.

The choicest product of Ying Yang and the five elements in the world is man, the rest are refuse products. The choicest among the choice ones are the sages and worthies, and the refuse among them are the foolish and the bad. And as man's body comes from the Yin and man's soul from the Yang he cannot be perfect. This is what the Lung philosophers called the material nature. Although all men have at birth a nature for goodness, still, if there is nothing to fix it, then desires arise and passions rule, and men are not far from being like beasts; hence, Confucius says: "Men's nature is originally alike, but in practice men become very different." The sages, knowing this, sought to fix the nature with the principles of moderation, uprightness, benevolence and righteousness. Heaven appointed rulers and teachers, who in turn established worship and music to improve men's disposition and set up governments and penalties in order to check men's wickedness. The best among the people are taken into schools where they study wisdom, virtue, benevolence and righteousness, so that they may know before hand how to conduct themselves as rulers or ruled.

And lest after many generations, there should be degeneration and difficulty in finding the truth, the principles of heaven and earth, of men and of all things, have been recorded in the Book of Odes for the use of after generations. The Chung Yung calls the practice of wisdom religion. Our religion well knows heaven's will; it looks on all under heaven as one family, great rulers as elder branches in their parent's clan, great ministers as chief officers of this clan and people at large as brothers of the same parents; and it holds that all things should be enjoyed in common, because it regards heaven and earth as the parents of all alike. And the commandment of the Confucian is "Fear greatly lest you offend against heaven."

Stress on Hu-
man Affairs.

But what Confucians lay great stress on is human affairs. What are these? These are the five relations and the five constants. What are the five relations? They are those of sovereign and minister, father and son, elder and younger brother, husband and wife, and that between friend and friend. Now, the ruler is the Son of heaven, to be honored above all others; therefore, in serving Him there has to be loyalty. The parents' goodness to their children is boundless; therefore, the parents should be served filially. Brothers are branches from the same root; therefore, mutual respect is important. The marriage relation is the origin of all human relations; therefore, mutual gentleness is important. As to friends, though as if strangers to our homes, it is important to be very affectionate.

When one desires to make progress in the practice of virtue as ruler or minister, as parent or child, as elder or younger brother, or as husband and wife; if anyone wishes to be perfect in any relation, how can it be done without a friend to exhort one to good and check one in evil? Therefore, one should seek to increase his friends. Among the five relations there are also the three hands. The ruler is the hand of the minister, the father is that of the son, and the husband is that of the wife. And the book of the Ta Hsiieh says: "From the

emperor down to the common people the fundamental thing for all to do is to cultivate virtue." If this fundamental foundation is not laid, then there cannot be order in the world. Therefore, great responsibility lies on the leaders. This is what Confucius means when he says: "When a ruler is upright he is obeyed without commands."

Now, to cause the doctrine of the five relations to be carried out everywhere by all under heaven, the ruler must be intelligent and the minister good, then the government will be just; the father must be loving and the son filial, the elder brother friendly, the younger brother respectful, the husband kind and the wife obedient, then the home will be right; in our relation with our friends there must be confidence, then customs will be reformed and order will not be difficult for the whole world, simply because the rulers lay the foundation for it in virtue.

What are the five constants? Benevolence, righteousness, worship, wisdom, faithfulness. Benevolence is love, righteousness is fitness, worship is principle, wisdom is thorough knowledge, faithfulness is what one can depend on. He who is able to restore the original good nature and to hold fast to it is called a worthy. He who has got hold of the spiritual nature and is at peace and rest is called a sage. He who sends forth unseen and infinite influences throughout all things is called divine. The influence of the five constants is very great and all living things are subject to them.

Influence of
the Five Con-
stants.

Mencius says: "He who has no pity is not a man; he who has no sense of shame for wrong is not a man; he who has no yielding disposition is not a man, and he who has not the sense of right and wrong is not a man. The sense of pity is the beginning of benevolence, the sense of shame for wrong is the beginning of righteousness, a yielding disposition is the beginning of religion, the sense of right and wrong is the beginning of wisdom. Faithfulness is not spoken of, as it is what makes the other four real; like the earth element among the five elements, without it the other four manifestly cannot be placed.

The Chung Yung says: "Sincerity or reality is the beginning and the end of things. There is no such thing as supreme sincerity without action. This is the use of faithfulness."

As to benevolence, it also includes righteousness, religion and wisdom, therefore, the sages consider that the most important thing is to get benevolence. The idea of benevolence is gentleness and liberal mindedness, that of righteousness is clear duty, that of religion is showing forth, that of wisdom is to gather silently. When there is gentleness, clear duty, showing forth and silent gathering constantly going on, then everything naturally falls to its proper place, just like the four seasons; *e. g.*: the spring influences are gentle and liberal and are life-giving ones; in summer life-giving things grow; in autumn these show themselves in harvest and in winter they are stored up. If there were no spring the other three seasons would have nothing; so it is said the benevolent man is the life. Extend and develop this

benevolence and all under heaven may be benefited thereby. This is how to observe human relation.

As to the doctrine of future life. Confucianism speaks of it most minutely. Cheng Tsze says the spirits are the forces or servants of heaven and earth and signs of creative power. Chu Fu Tsze says: "Speaking of two powers, the demons are the intelligent ones of Yin, the gods are the intelligent ones of Yang; speaking of one power, the supreme and originating is called God, the reverse and the returning is demon."

Confucius, replying to Tsai Wo, says: "When flesh and bones die below the dust the material Yin becomes dust, but the immaterial rises above the grave in great light, has odor and is very pitiable. This is the immaterial essence." The Chung Yung, quoting Confucius, says: "The power of the spirits is very great! You look and cannot see them, you listen and cannot hear them, but they are embodied in all things without missing any, causing all men to reverence them and be purified, and be well adorned in order to sacrifice unto them." All things are alive, as if the gods were right above our heads or on our right hand or on the left. Yih King makes much of divining to get decisions from the gods, knowing that the gods are the forces of heaven and earth in operation. Although unseen, still they influence; if difficult to prove, yet easily known. The great sages and great worthies, the loyal ministers, the righteous scholars, filial sons, the pure women of the world having received the purest influences of the divinest forces of heaven and earth, when on earth were heroes, when dead are the gods. Their influences continue for many generations to affect the world for good, therefore many venerate and sacrifice unto them.

As to evil men, they arise from the evil forces of nature; when dead, they also influence for evil, and we must get holy influences to destroy evil ones.

Rewards and
Punishments.

As to rewards and punishments the ancient sages also spoke of them. The great Yu, B. C. 2255, said: "Follow what is right and you will be fortunate; do not follow it and you will be unfortunate; the results are only shadows and echoes of our acts." Tang, B. C. 1766, says: "Heaven's way is to bless the good and bring calamity on the evil." His minister, Yi Yin, said: "It is only God who is perfectly just; good actions are blessed with a hundred favors; evil actions are cursed with a hundred evils." Confucius, speaking of the "Book of Changes" (Yih King), said: "Those who multiply good deeds will have joys to overflowing; those who multiply evil deeds will have calamities running over."

But this is very different from Taoism, which says that there are angels from heaven examining into men's good and evil deeds, and from Buddhism, which says that there is a purgatory or hell according to one's deeds. Rewards and punishments arise from our different actions just as water flows to the ocean and as fire seizes what is dry; without expecting certain consequences they come inevitably. When

these consequences do not appear they are like cold in summer or heat in winter, or like both happening the same day; but this we say is unnatural. Therefore, it is said, sincerity is the way of heaven. If we say that the gods serve heaven exactly as mandarins do on earth, bringing quick retribution on every little thing, this is really to make them appear very slow. At present men say, "Thunder killed the bad man." But it is not so, either. The Han philosopher, Tung Chung Shu (second century B. C.), says: "Vapors, when they clash above, make rain; when they clash below make fog; wind is nature's breathing. Thunder is the sound of clouds clashing against each other. Lightning is light emitted by their collision. Thus we see that when a man is killed it is by the collision of these clouds."

As to becoming genii and transmigration of souls, these are still more beside the mark. If we became like genii, then we would live on without dying; how could the world hold so many? If we transmigrate, then so many would transmigrate from the human life and ghosts would be numerous. Besides when the lamp goes out and is lit again it is not the former flame that is lit. When the cloud has a rainbow it rains, but it is not the same rainbow as when the rainbow appeared before. From this we know also that these doctrines of transmigration should not be believed in. So much on the virtue of the unseen and hereafter.

As to the great aim and broad basis of Confucianism, we say it searches into things, it extends knowledge, it has a sincere aim, *i. e.*, to have a right heart, a virtuous life, so as to regulate the home, to govern the nation and to give peace to all under heaven. The book of "Great Learning," Ja Hsigh, has already clearly spoken of these. The foundation is laid in illustrating virtue, for our religion in discussing government regards virtue as the foundation, and wealth as the superstructure. Mencius says: "When the rulers and ministers are only seeking gain the nation is in danger." He also says: "There is no benevolent man who neglects his parents, there is no righteous man who helps himself before his ruler." From this it is apparent what is most important.

A
Aim. Sincere

Not that we do not speak of gain; the "Great Learning" says: "There is a right way to get gain. Let the producers be many and the consumers few. Let there be activity in production and economy in the expenditure. Then the wealth will always be sufficient. But it is important that the high and low should share it alike."

As to how to govern the country and give peace to all under heaven the nine paths are most important. The nine paths are: Cultivate a good character, honor the good, love your parents, respect great offices, carry out the wishes of the ruler and ministers, regard the common people as your children, invite all kinds of skillful workmen, be kind to strangers, have consideration for all the feudal chiefs. These are the great principles.

Their origin and history may also be stated. Far up in mythical ancient times, before literature was known, Fu Hi arose and drew the eight diagrams in order to understand the superhuman powers and

the nature of all things. At the time of Tang Yao (B. C. 2356) they were able to illustrate noble virtue. Nine generations lived together in one home in love and peace, and the people were firm and intelligent. Yao handed down to Shun a saying, "Sincerely hold fast to the 'mean'." Shun transmitted it to Yu, and said: "The mind of man is restless, prone to err; its affinity for the right way is small. Be discriminating; be undivided that you may sincerely hold fast to the mean." Yu transmitted this to Tang, of the Siang dynasty (B. C. 1766). Tang transmitted it to Kings Wen and Wu, of the Chow dynasty (B. C. 1122). These transmitted it to Duke Kung. And these were all able to observe this rule of the heart by which they held fast to the "mean."

When Confucius Arose.

The Chow dynasty later degenerated; then there arose Confucius, who transmitted the doctrines of Yao and Shun as if they had been his ancestors, elegantly displayed the doctrines of Wen and Wu, edited the odes and the history, reformed religion, made notes on the "Book of Changes," wrote the annals of spring and autumn, and spoke of governing the nation, saying: "Treat matters seriously and be faithful; be temperate and love men; employ men according to proper times, and in teaching your pupils you must do so with love." He said to Yen Tsze: "Self-sacrifice and truth is benevolence. If you can for one whole day entirely sacrifice self and be true, then all under heaven will become benevolent." Speaking of being able to put away selfishness and attaining to the truth of heaven, everything is possible to such a heart.

Alas! He was not able to get his virtues put into practice, but his disciples recorded his words and deeds and wrote the Confucian Analects. His disciple, Jseng Tsze, composed the Great Learning. His proud son, Tsze Sze, composed the Doctrine of the Mean (Chung Yung). When the contending states were quarreling, Mencius, with a loving heart that could not endure wrong, arose to save the times. The rulers of the time would not use him; so he composed a book in seven chapters. After this, although the ages changed this, religion flourished. In the Han dynasty, Tung Chung Shu (twentieth century B. C.); in the Sui dynasty, Wang Tung (A. D. 583-617); in the Tang dynasty Han Yo (A. D. 768-824), each made some part of this doctrine better known. In the Sung dynasty (960-1260) these were the disciples of the philosophers Cheng, Chow and Chang, searching into the spiritual nature of man, and Chu Fu-Tsze collected their works and this religion shone with great brightness. Our present dynasty, respecting scholarship and considering truth important, placed the philosopher Cho in Confucian temples to be revered and sacrificed to. Confucianists all follow Chu Fu-Tsze's comments. From ancient times till now those who followed the doctrines of Confucius were able to govern the country; whenever these were not followed there was disorder.

On looking at it down the ages there is also clear evidence of results in governing the country and its superiority to other religions.

There is a prosperity of Tang Yis, of the dynasties Hsia Siang and Chow (B. C. 2356, B. C. 255), when virtue and good government flourished. It is needless to enlarge upon them. At the time of the contending states there arose theorists, and all under heaven became disordered. The Tsin dynasty (of Tsin She-Hwang fame) burned the books and buried the Confucianists and did many other heartless things, and also went to seek the art of becoming immortal (Taoism), and the empire was soon lost.

Results in
Governing the
Country.

Then the Han dynasty arose (B. C. 206-A. D. 220). Although it leaned toward Taoism, the people, after having suffered so long from the cruelties of the Tsin, were easily governed. Although the religious rites of the Shu Sun-tung do not command our confidence, the elucidation of the ancient classics and books we owe mostly to the Confucianists of the Han period. Although the emperor, the emperor Wu, of the western (early) Han dynasty, was fond of genii (Taoism), he knew how to select worthy ministers. Although the emperor Ming, of the eastern (later) Han dynasty, introduced Buddhism, he was able to respect the Confucian doctrines. Since so many followed Confucianism, good mandarins were very abundant under the eastern and western Han dynasties, and the dynasty lasted very long.

Passing on to the epoch of the three kingdoms and the Tsin dynasty (A. D. 221-419) the people then leaned toward Taoism and neglected the country. Afterward the north and south quarreled and Emperor Laing Wu reigned the longest, but lost all by believing in Buddhism and going into the monastery at Tsing Tai, where he died of starvation at Tai Ching. When Yuen Ti came to the throne (A. D. 552) the soldiers of Wei arrived while the teaching of Taoism was still going on, and the country was ruined. It is not worth while to speak of the Sui dynasty. The first emperor of the Tang dynasty (618-907) greatly sought out famous Confucianists and increased the demand for scholars, so that the country was ruled almost equal to Cheng and Kang, of ancient times. Although there was the affair of Empress Woo and Lu Shan, the dynasty flourished long. Its fall was because the emperor Huen Tsung was fond of Taoism and Buddhism, and was put to death by taking wrong medicine. The emperor Mu Tsung also believed in Taoism, but got ill by eating immortality pills. After this the emperor Wu Tsung was fond of Taoism and reigned only a short time. The emperor Tsung followed Buddhism and the dynasty fell into a precarious condition.

Passing by the five dynasties (907-960) on to the first emperor of the Sung dynasty (960-1360) who, cherishing the people and having good government, step by step prospered—when Jen Tsung ruled he revered heaven and cared for the people; he reformed the punishment and lightened the taxes, and was assisted by such scholars as Han Ki, Fan Chung Yen, Foo Pih, Ou Yang Sui, Wen Yen Poh and Chas Pien. They established the government at the mountain Pas Sang and raised the people to the state of peace which is still in every home. Such government may be called benevolent.

Benevolent
Government.

Afterward there arose the troubles of Kin, when the good ministers were destroyed by cliques and the Sang dynasty moved to the south of China.

When the Mongol dynasty (A. D. 1260-1368) arose, it believed in and employed Confucian methods, and all under heaven was in order. In the time of Jen Chung the names of the philosophers, Chow and Cheng (of the Sung dynasty), were placed in the Confucian temples to be sacrificed to. They carried out the system of examinations and sent commissioners to travel throughout the land to inquire into the sufferings of the people.


The empress served the emperor dowager with filial piety and treated all his relations with honor, and he may be called one of our noble rulers, but the death of Shunti was owing to his passion for pleasure. He practiced the methods of western priests (Buddhists) to regulate the health and had no heart for matters of state.

When the first emperor of the Ming dynasty (A. D. 1368-1644) arose and reformed the religion and ritual of the empire, he called it the great, peaceful dynasty. The pity was that he selected Buddhist priests to attend on the princes of the empire, and the priest Tao Yen corrupted the Pekin prince, and a rebellious spirit sprung up, which was a great mistake. Then Yen Tsung, too, employed Yen Sung, who only occupied himself in worship. Hi Tsung employed Ni Ngan who defamed the loyal and the good, and the dynasty failed. These are the evidences of the value of Confucianism in every age.

But in our present dynasty worship and religion have been wisely regulated, and the government is in fine order; noble ministers and able officers have followed in succession down all these centuries.

That is what has caused Confucianism to be transmitted from the oldest times till now, and wherein it constitutes its superiority to other religions is that it does not encourage mysteries and strange things or marvels. It is impartial and upright. It is a doctrine of great impartiality and strict uprightness, which one may body forth in one's person and carry out with vigor in one's life; therefore, we say, when the sun and moon come forth (as in Confucianism), then the light of candles can be dispensed with.

Wisely Regulated.



Caravan to the Pyramids.

Confucianism.

Paper by HON. PUNG KWANG YU, First Secretary of the Chinese Legation,
Washington, D. C.



Man the Heart
of Heaven and
Earth.

LL Chinese reformers of ancient and modern times have either exercised supreme authority as political heads of the nation or filled high posts as ministers of state. The only notable exception is Confucius. "Man," says Confucius in the Book of Rites, "is the product of heaven and earth, the union of the active and passive principles, the conjunction of the soul and spirit, and the ethereal essence of the five elements." Again he says: "Man is the heart of heaven and earth, and the nucleus of the five elements, formed by assimilating food, by distinguishing sounds and by the action of light."

Now, the heaven and earth, the active and passive principles, and the soul and spirit are dualisms resulting from unities. The product of heaven and earth, the union of the active and passive principles, the conjunction of the soul and spirit, are unities resulting from dualisms. Man, being the connecting link between unities and dualisms, is, therefore, called the heart of heaven and earth. By reason of his being the heart of heaven and earth humanity is his natural faculty and love his controlling emotion. "Humanity," says Confucius, "is the characteristic of man." On this account humanity stands at the head of the five faculties, or the innate qualities of the soul, namely, humanity, rectitude, propriety, understanding and truthfulness. Humanity must have the social relations for its sphere of action. Love must begin at home.

What are the social relations? They are the sovereign and subject, parent and child, husband and wife, elder and young brothers and friends. These are called the five relations or natural relations. As the relation of husband and wife must have been recognized before that of sovereign or subject, or that of parent and child, the relation of husband and wife is, therefore, the first of the social relations. The relation of husband and wife bears a certain analogy to that of "kien" and "kium." The word kien may be taken in the sense of heaven,

sovereign, parent or husband. As the earth is subservient to heaven, so is the subject subservient to the sovereign, the child to the parent and the wife to the husband. These three mainstays of the social structure have their origin in the law of nature, and do not owe their existence to the invention of men.

The emotions are but the manifestations of the soul's faculties when acted upon by external objects. There are seven emotions, namely, joy, anger, grief, fear, love, hate and desire. The faculties of the soul derive their origin from nature, and are, therefore, called natural faculties; the emotions emanate from man, and are, therefore, called human emotions.

Humanity sums up the virtues of the five natural faculties. Filial duty lies at the foundation of humanity. The sense of propriety serves to regulate the emotions. The recognition of the relation of husband and wife is the first step in the cultivation and development of humanity. The principles that direct human progress are sincerity and charity, and the principles that carry it forward are devotion and honor. "Do not unto others," says Confucius, "whatsoever ye would not that others should do unto you." Again, he says:

"A noble-minded man has four rules to regulate his conduct: To serve one's parents in such a manner as is required of a son; to serve one's sovereign in such a manner as is required of a subject; to serve one's elder brother in such a manner as is required of a younger brother; to set an example of dealing with one's friends in such a manner as is required of friends."

This succinct statement puts in a nutshell all the requirements of sincerity, charity, devotion and honor; in other words, of humanity itself. Therefore, all natural virtues and established doctrines that relate to the duties of man in his relations to society must have their origin in humanity. On the other hand, the principle that regulates the actions and conduct of men, from beginning to end, can be no other than propriety.

All the Requirements of Humanity.

What are the rules of propriety? The "Book of Rites" treats of such as relate to ceremonies on attaining majority, marriages, funerals, sacrifices, court receptions, banquets, the worship of heaven, the observance of stated feasts, the sphere of woman and the education of youth. The rules of propriety are based on rectitude and should be carried out with understanding, so as to show their truth, to the end that humanity may appear in its full splendor. The aim is to enable the five innate qualities of the soul to have full and free play, and yet to enable each in its action to promote the action of the rest. If we were to go into details on this subject and enlarge on the various lines of thought as they present themselves we should find that myriads of words and thousands of paragraphs would not suffice, for then we should have to deal with such problems as relate to the observation of facts, the systematization of knowledge, the establishment of right principles, the rectification of the heart, the disciplining of self, the regulation of the family, the government of the nation and the pacification of the world.

Such are the elements of instruction and self-education which Confucianists consider as essential to make man what he ought to be.

Origin of Religious Worship.

Now, man is only a species of naked animal. He was naturally stricken with fear and went so far as to worship animals against which he was helpless. To this may be traced the origin of religious worship. It was only man, however, that nature had endowed with intelligence. On this account he could take advantage of the natural elements, and his primary object was to increase the comforts and remove the dangers of life. As he passed from a savage to a civilized state he initiated movements for the education of the rising generation by defining the relations and duties of society and by laying special emphasis on the disciplining of self. Therefore, man is called the "nucleus of the five elements and the ethereal essence of the five elements formed by assimilating food, by distinguishing sounds and by the action of light." Herein lies the dignity of human nature. Herein we recognize the chief characteristic that distinguishes man from animals.

The various tribes of feathered, haired, scaled, or shelled animals, to be sure, are not entirely incapable of emotion. As emotions are only phenomena of the soul's different faculties, animals may be said to possess, to a limited degree, faculties similar to the faculties of man, and are not therefore entirely devoid of the pure essence of nature. From the beginning of the creation the intelligence of animals has remained the same, and will doubtless remain the same until the end of time. They are incapable of improvement or progress. This shows that the substance of their organization must be derived from the imperfect and gross elements of the earth, so that when it unites with the ethereal elements to form the faculties, the spiritual qualities can not gain full play, as in the case of man. "In the evolution of the animated creation," says Confucius, in connection with this subject, "nature can only act upon the substance of each organized being, and bring out its innate qualities. She, therefore, furnishes proper nourishment to those individuals that stand erect and trample upon those individuals that lie prostrate." The idea is that nature has no fixed purpose.

Natural Imperfections.

As for man, he also has natural imperfections. This is what Confucianists call essential imperfections in the constitution. The reason is that the organizations which different individuals have received from the earth are very diverse in character. It is but natural that the faculties of different individuals should develop abilities and capabilities which are equally diverse in degrees and kinds. It is not that different individuals have received from nature different measures of intelligence.

Man only can remove the imperfections inherent in the substance of his organization by directing his mind to intellectual pursuits, by abiding in virtue, by following the dictates of humanity, by subduing anger, and by restraining the appetites. Lovers of mankind, who have the regeneration of the world at heart, would doubtless consider it

desirable to have some moral panacea which could completely remove all the imperfections from the organic substance of the human species, so that the whole race might be reformed with ease and expedition. But such a method of procedure does not seem to be the way in which nature works. She only brings out the innate qualities of every substance. Still it is worth while to cherish such a desire on account of its tendency to elevate human nature, though we know it to be impossible of fulfillment, owing to the limitations of the human organization.

Man is then endowed with the faculties of the highest dignity. Yet there are those who so far degrade their manhood as to give themselves up to the unlimited indulgence of those appetites which they have in common with birds, beasts and fishes, to the utter loss of their moral sense without being sensible of their degradation, perhaps. In case they have really become insensible then even heaven cannot possibly do anything with them. But if they, at any time, become sensible of their condition, they must be stricken with a sense of shame, not unmingled, perhaps, with fear and trembling. If, after experiencing a sense of shame, mingled with fear and trembling, they repent of their evil doings, then they become men again with their humanity restored. This is a doctrine maintained by all the schools of Confucianists.

Faculties of
Dignity.

"Reason," says Confucius in his notes to the "Book of Changes," "consists in the proper union of the active and passive principles of nature." Again, he says: "What is called spirit is the inscrutable state of 'yin' and 'yang,' or the passive and active principles of nature." Now, "yang" is heaven, or ether. Whenever ether, by condensation, assumes a substantive form and remains suspended in the heavens, there is an admixture of the active and passive principles of nature, with the active principle predominating. "Yin," or the passive principle of nature, is earth or substance. Whenever a substance which has the property of absorbing ether is attracted to the earth there is an admixture of the active and passive principles of nature, with the passive principle predominating.

Active and
Passive Prin-
ciples.

As the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, its going and coming making one day, so the quantity of ether which the earth holds varies from time to time. Exhalation follows absorption; systole succeeds diastole. It is these small changes that produce day and night. As the sun travels also from north to south and makes a complete revolution in one year, so the quantity of ether which the earth holds varies from time to time. Exhalation follows absorption; systole succeeds diastole. It is these great changes that produce heat and cold. The movements of the active and passive principles of the universe bear a certain resemblance to the movements of the sun. There are periods of rest, periods of activity, periods of expansion, and periods of contraction. The two principles may sometimes repel each other but can never go beyond each other's influences. They may also attract each other, but do not by this means spend their

force. They seem to permeate all things from beginning to end. They are invisible and inaudible, yet it cannot be said for this reason they do not exist. This is what is meant by inscrutability, and this is what Confucius calls spirit.

Nature an Active Element.

Still it is necessary to guard against confounding this conception of spirit with that of nature. Nature is an entirely active element and must needs have a passion element to operate upon in order to bring out its energy. On the other hand, it is also an error to confound spirit with matter. Matter is entirely passive and must needs have some active element to act upon it in order to concentrate its virtues. It is to the action and reaction, as well as to the mutual sustentation of the essences of the active and passive principles, that the spirit of anything owes its being. In case there is no union of the active and passive principles, the ethereal and substantive elements lie separate, and the influences of the heavens and the earth cannot come into conjunction. This being the case, whence can spirits derive their substance? Thus the influences of the heavens and material objects must act and react upon each other, and enter into the composition of each other, in order to enable every material object to incorporate a due proportion of energy with its virtues. Each object is then able to assume its proper form, whether large or small, and acquire the properties peculiar to its constitution, to the end that it may fulfill its functions in the economy of nature.

For example, the spirits of mountains, hills, rivers and marshes are invisible; we see only the manifestations of their power in winds, clouds, thunders and rains. The spirits of birds, quadrupeds, insects and fishes are invisible; we see only the manifestations of their power in flying, running, burrowing and swimming. The spirits of terrestrial and aquatic plants are invisible; we see only the manifestations of their power in flowers, fruits and the various tissues. The spirit of man is invisible; yet when we consider that the eyes can see, the ears can hear, the mouth can distinguish flavors, the nose can smell and the mind can grasp what is most minute as well as what is most remote, how can we account for all this?

In the case of man, the spirit is in a more concentrated and better disciplined state than the spirits of the rest of the created things. On this account the spirit of man after death, though separated from the body, is still able to retain its essential virtues and does not become easily dissipated. This is the ghost or disembodied spirit.

The followers of Taoism and Buddhism often speak of immortality and everlasting life. Accordingly they subject themselves to a course of discipline, in the hope that they may by this means attain to that happy Buddhistic or Taoistic existence. They aim merely to free the spirit from the limitations of the body. Taoist and Buddhist priests often speak of the rolls of spirits and the records of souls, and make frequent mention of heaven and hell. They seek to inculcate that the good will receive their due reward and the wicked will suffer eternal punishment. They mean to convey the idea, of course, that rewards

and punishments will be dealt out to the spirits of men after death according to their deserts. Such beliefs doubtless had their origin in attempts to influence the actions of men by appealing to their likes and dislikes. The purpose of inducing men to do good and forsake evil by presenting in striking contrast a hereafter to be striven for and a hereafter to be avoided is laudable enough in some respects. But it is the perpetuation of falsehood by slavishly clinging to errors that deserve condemnation. For this reason Confucianists do not accept such doctrines, though they make no attempt to suppress them.

"We cannot as yet," says Confucius, "perform our duties to men; how can we perform our duties to spirits?" Again, he says: "We know not as yet about life; how can we know about death?" "From this time on," says Tsang-tze, "I know that I am saved." "Let my consistent actions remain," says Chang-tze, "and I shall die in peace." It will be seen that the wise and good men of China have never thought it advisable to give up teaching the duties of life and turn to speculations on the conditions of souls and spirits after death. But from various passages, in the "Book of Changes," it may be inferred that the souls of men after death are in the same state as they were before birth.


Why is it that Confucianists apply the word "ti" to heaven and not to spirits? The reason is that there is but one "ti," or Supreme Ruler, the governor of all subordinate spirits, who cannot be said to be propitious or unpropitious, beneficent or maleficent. Inferior spirits, on the other hand, owe their existence to material substances. As substances have noxious or useful properties, so some spirits may be propitious, others unpropitious, and some benevolent, others malevolent. Man is part of the material universe; the spirit of man, a species of spirits.

All created things can be distributed into groups, and individuals of the same species are generally found together. A man, therefore, whose heart is good, must have a good spirit. By reason of the influence exerted by one spirit upon another, a good spirit naturally tends to attract all other propitious and good spirits. This is happiness. Now, if every individual has a good heart, then from the action and reaction of spirit upon spirit, only propitious and good influences can flow. The country is blessed with prosperity; the government fulfills its purpose. What happiness can be compared with this?

On the other hand, when a man has an evil heart his spirit cannot but be likewise evil. On account of the influence exerted by one spirit upon another, the call of this spirit naturally meets with ready responses from all other unpropitious and evil spirits. This is misery. If every individual harbors an evil heart, then a responsive chord is struck in all unpropitious and evil spirits. Evil influences are scattered over the country. Misfortunes and calamities overtake the land. There is an end of good government. What misery can be compared with this?

Thus, in the administration of public affairs, a wise legislator

Good Heart,
Good Spirit.



always takes into consideration the spirit of the times in devising means for the advancement and promotion of civilization. He puts his reliance on ceremonies and music to carry on the good work, and makes use of punishments and the sword as a last resort, in accordance with the good or bad tendency of the age. His aim is to restore the human heart to its pristine innocence by establishing a standard of goodness and by pointing out a way of salvation to every creature. The right principles of action can only be discovered by studying the waxing and waning of the active and passive elements of nature, as set forth in the "Book of Changes," and surely cannot be understood by those who believe in what priests call the dispensations of Providence.

Human affairs are made up of thousands of acts of individuals. What, therefore, constitutes a good action, and what a bad action? What is done for the sake of others is disinterested; a disinterested action is good and may be called beneficial. What is done for the sake of one's self is selfish; a selfish action is bad and naturally springs from avarice.

Suppose there is a man who has never entertained a good thought and never done a good deed, does it stand to reason that such a wretch can, by means of sacrifices and prayers, attain to the blessings of life? Let us take the opposite case and suppose that there is a man who has never harbored a bad thought and never done a bad deed, does it stand to reason that there is no escape for such a man from adverse fortune except through prayers and sacrifices? "My prayers," says Confucius, "were offered up long ago." The meaning he wishes to convey is that he considers his prayers to consist in living a virtuous life and in constantly obeying the dictates of conscience.

He, therefore, looks upon prayers as of no avail to deliver any one from sickness. "He who sins against heaven," again he says, "has no place to pray." What he means is that even spirits have no power to bestow blessings on those who have sinned against the decrees of heaven.

The wise and the good, however, make use of offerings and sacrifices simply as a means of purifying themselves from the contamination of the world, so that they become susceptible of spiritual influences and be in sympathetic touch with the invisible world, to the end that calamities may be averted and blessings secured thereby. Still, sacrifices cannot be offered by all persons without distinction. Only the emperor can offer sacrifices to heaven. Only governors of provinces can offer sacrifices to the spirits of mountains and rivers, land and agriculture. Lower officers of the government can offer sacrifices only to their ancestors of the five preceding generations, but are not allowed to offer sacrifices to heaven. The common people, of course, are likewise denied this privilege. They can offer sacrifices only to their ancestors.


All persons, from the emperor down to the common people, are

strictly required to observe the worship of ancestors. The only way in which a virtuous man and a dutiful son can show his sense of obligation to the authors of his being is to serve them when dead, as when they were alive, when departed as when present. It is for this reason that the most enlightened rulers have always made filial duty the guiding principle of government. Observances of this character have nothing to do with religious celebrations and ceremonies.

Toward the close of the Ming dynasty the local authorities of a certain district invited a priest from Tsoh to live in their midst. The people began to vie with one another in their eagerness to worship the new-fangled deities of Tsoh. Shortly afterward an invitation was extended to a priest from Yueh to settle there also. Then the people, in like manner, began to vie with one another in their eagerness to worship the new-fangled deities of Yueh. The Tsoh priest, stirred up with envy, declared to the people that the heaven he taught was the only true heaven, and the deities he served were the only true deities, adding, that by making use of his prayers they could obtain the forgiveness of their sins and the blessings of life, and if they did not make use of his prayers even the good could not attain to happiness. He at the same time denounced the teachings of the Yueh priest as altogether false. The Yueh priest then returned the compliment in similar but more energetic language. Yet they made no attack on the inefficiency of prayers, the reason being that both employed the same kind of tools in carrying on their trade.

To say that there are true and false deities is reasonable enough. But can heaven be so divided that one part may be designated as belonging to Tsoh and another part to Yueh? It is merely an attempt to practice on the credulity of men, to dogmatize on the dispensation of Providence, by saying that no blessings can fall to the lot of the good without prayer, and that prayer can turn into a blessing the retribution that is sure to overtake the wicked.

True and
False Deities.



Interior of the Mosque of Sultan Hassan.

Genesis and Development of Confucianism.

Paper by DR. ERNEST FABER, of Shanghai, China.



IN order to show the greater contrast in modern China and its Confucianism compared with China in the times of Confucius and Mencius and their teachings, it seems best to invite both Confucius and Mencius to a short visit in the middle kingdom. On their arrival Mencius began to congratulate his great master on the success of his sage teachings, but Confucius would not accept congratulations until he had learned the cause of the success.

He found that the spread of Confucianism was brought about, not by the peaceful attraction of neighboring states but by bloody wars and suppression. The constitution of the state was changed and ruins were everywhere. He noticed splendid temples dedicated to gods he had never heard of, while around these magnificent homes lived people who were poor and famine-stricken or who spent their lives opium smoking and gambling. He found that benevolent institutions were mismanaged and that the money which belonged to the poor found its way into the pockets of the respectable managers dressed in long silk robes.

There had been changes in dress which chilled the hearts of Confucius and Mencius. They sighed when they saw women with distorted feet and men wearing queues. As they wandered along they found that sacrifices were made at graves, and that every one bowed down before the genii of good luck. In the colleges they found that most of the time was spent in empty routine and phraseology. There was no basis for the formation of character.

Passing by a large bookstore they entered and looked about them in surprise at the thousands of books on the shelves. "Alas!" said Confucius, "I find here the same state of things I found in China 2,400 years ago. The very thing that induced me to clear the ancient literature of thousands of useless works, retaining only a few, filling

Confucius
Sighs.

five volumes, worthy to be transmitted to after ages. Is nothing left of my spirit among the myriads of scholars professing to be my followers? Why do they not clear away the heaps of rubbish that have accumulated during twenty centuries? They should transmit the essence of former ages to the young generation as an inheritance of wisdom which they have put into practice and so increase."

In Honor of
Famous Women.

Going into a gentleman's house, they were invited to take chairs, and looked in vain for the mat spread on the ground. Tobacco pipes were handed to the sages, but they declined to smoke, saying that the ancients valued pure air most highly. Seeing many arches erected in honor of famous women, they wondered that the fame of women should enter the streets and be proclaimed on highways. "The rule of antiquity is," said Confucius, "that nothing should be known of women outside the female departments, either good or evil." Then they found out that most of the arches were for females who had committed suicide, or who had cut a little flesh from their own bodies, from the arm or the thigh, as medicine for a sick parent. Others had refused marriage to nurse their old parents. Arches were erected to a few who had reached an old age, and to a very few who had performed charitable works.

Neither Confucius nor Mencius raised any objection to these arches, though they did not agree to some of the reasons given for their erection. They did not approve of the imperial sanction of the Taoist pope, the favors shown to Buddhism, and especially to the Lamas in Peking, the widespread superstition of spiritism, the worship of animals, fortune telling, excesses and abuses in ancestral worship, theatrical performances, dragon festivals, idol processions and displays in the street, infanticide, prostitution, retribution made a prominent move in morals, codification of penal law, publication of the statutes of the empire and cessation of the imperial tours of inspection.

Then they noted the progress of the west, the railroads, the steam engines and steamers of immense size moving on quickly, even against wind and tide. "Oh, my little children," said Confucius, "all ye who honor my name, the people of the west are in advance of you as the ancients were in advance of the rest of the world. Therefore, learn what they have good and correct their evil by what you have better. This is my meaning of the great principle of reciprocity."

Points of Contact Between Christianity and Mohammedanism.

Paper by GEORGE WASHBURN, D. D., President of Robert College,
Constantinople.



T is not my purpose to enter upon any defense or criticism of Mohammedanism, but simply to state, as impartially as possible, its points of contact and contrast with Christianity.

The chief difficulty in such a statement arises from the fact that there are as many different opinions on theological questions among Moslems as among Christians, and that it is impossible to present any summary of Mohammedan doctrine which will be accepted by all.

The faith of Islam is based primarily upon the Koran, which is believed to have been delivered to the prophet at sundry times by the angel Gabriel, and upon the traditions reporting the life and words of the prophet; and secondarily, upon the opinions of certain distinguished theologians of the second century of the hegira, especially, for the Sunnis, of the four Imams, Hanife, Shafi, Malik and Hannbel.

The Shiites, or followers of Aali, reject these last with many of the received traditions, and hold opinions which the great body of Moslems regard as heretical. In addition to the two-fold divisions of Sunnis and Shiites and of the sects of the four Imams, there are said to be several hundred minor sects.

It is, in fact, very difficult for an honest inquirer to determine what is really essential to the faith. A distinguished Moslem statesman and scholar once assured me that nothing was essential beyond a belief in the existence and unity of God. And several years ago the Sheik-ul-Islam, the highest authority in Constantinople, in a letter to a German inquirer, states that whoever confesses that there is but one God, and that Mohammed is his prophet, is a true Moslem, although to be a good one it is necessary to observe the five points of confes-

What is Essential to the Moslem Faith.

sion, prayer, fasting, almsgiving and pilgrimage; but the difficulty about this apparently simple definition in that belief in Mohammed as the prophet of God involves a belief in all his teaching, and we come back at once to the question what that teaching was.

The great majority of Mohammedans believe in the Koran, the traditions and the teaching of the school of Hanife, and we cannot do better than to take these doctrines and compare them with what are generally regarded as the essential principles of Christianity.

With this explanation we may discuss the relations of Christianity and Mohammedanism as historical, dogmatic and practical.

Historical
Relations.

It would hardly be necessary to speak in this connection of the historical relations of Christianity and Islam if they had not seemed, to some distinguished writers, so important as to justify the statement that Mohammedanism is a form and outgrowth of Christianity; in fact, essentially a Christian sect.

Carlyle, for example, says: "Islam is definable as a confused form of Christianity." And Draper calls it "The southern reformation, akin to that in the north under Luther." Dean Stanley and Dr. Doellinger make similar statements.

While there is a certain semblance of truth in their view, it seems to me not only misleading but essentially false.

Neither Mohammed nor any of his earlier followers had ever been Christians, and there is no satisfactory evidence that up to the time of his announcing his prophetic mission he had interested himself at all in Christianity. No such theory is necessary to account for his monotheism. The citizens of Mecca were mostly idolaters, but a few, known as Hanifs, were pure deists, and the doctrine of the unity of God was not unknown theoretically even by those who, in their idolatry, had practically abandoned it. The temple at Mecca was known as Beit ullah, the house of God. The name of the prophet's father was Abdallah, the servant of God, and "by Allah" was a common oath among the people.

The one God was nominally recognized, but in fact forgotten in the worship of the stars, of Lat and Ozza and Manah, and of the 360 idols in the temple at Mecca. It was against this prevalent idolatry that Mohammed revolted, and he claimed that in so doing he had returned to the pure religion of Abraham. Still, Mohammedanism is no more a reformed Judaism than it is a form of Christianity. It was essentially a new religion.

The Koran claimed to be a new and perfect revelation of the will of God, and from the time of the prophet's death to this day no Moslem has appealed to the ancient traditions of Arabia or to the Jewish or Christian Scriptures as the ground of his faith. The Koran and the traditions are sufficient and final. I believe that every orthodox Moslem regards Islam as a separate, distinct, and absolutely exclusive religion; and there is nothing to be gained by calling it a form of Christianity. But, after having set aside this unfounded statement, and fully acknowledged the independent origin of Islam, there is

still an historical relationship between it and Christianity which demands our attention

The prophet recognized the Christian and Jewish Scriptures as the word of God, although it cannot be proved that he had ever read them. They are mentioned 131 times in the Koran, but there is only one quotation from the Old Testament, and one from the New. The historical parts of the Koran correspond with the Talmud, and the writing current among the heretical Christian sects, such as the Protevangelium of James, the pseudo Matthew, and the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, rather than with the Bible. His information was probably obtained verbally from his Jewish and Christian friends, who seem, in some cases, to have deceived him intentionally. He seems to have believed their statements, that his coming was foretold in the Scriptures, and to have hoped for some years that they would accept him as their promised leader.

*The Koran
and the Tal-
mud.*

His confidence in the Christians was proved by his sending his persecuted followers to take refuge with the Christian king of Abyssinia. He had visited Christian Syria, and, if tradition can be trusted, he had some intimate Christian friends. With the Jews he was on still more intimate terms during his last years at Mecca and the first at Medina.

But in the end he attacked and destroyed the Jews and declared war against the Christians, making a distinction, however, in his treatment of idolaters and "the people of the Book," allowing the latter, if they quietly submitted to his authority, to retain their religion on the condition of an annual payment of a tribute or ransom for their lives. If, however, they resisted, the men were to be killed and the women and children sold as slaves (Koran, sura ix). In the next world Jews, Christians and idolaters are alike consigned to eternal punishment in hell.

Some have supposed that a verse in the second sura of the Koran was intended to teach a more charitable doctrine. It reads: "Surely those who believe, whether Jews, Christians or Sabians, whoever believeth in God and the last day, and doth that which is right, they shall have their reward with the Lord. No fear shall come upon them, neither shall they be grieved." But Moslem commentators rightly understand this as only teaching that if Jews, Christians or Sabians become Moslems they will be saved, the phrase used being the common one to express faith in Islam.

In the third sura it is stated in so many words: "Whoever followeth any other religion than Islam it shall not be accepted of him, and at the last day he shall be of those that perish."

This is the orthodox doctrine; but it should be said that one meets with Moslems who take a more hopeful view of the ultimate fate of those who are sincere and honest followers of Christ.

The question whether Mohammedanism has been in any way modified since the time of the prophet by its contact with Christianity I think every Moslem would answer in the negative. There is much

to be said on the other side, as, for example, it must seem to a Christian student that the offices and qualities assigned to the prophet by the traditions, which are not claimed for him in the Koran, must have been borrowed from the Christian teaching in regard to Christ; but we have not time to enter upon the discussion of this question.

In comparing the dogmatic statements of Islam and Christianity we must confine ourselves as strictly as possible to what is generally acknowledged to be essential in each faith. To go beyond this would be to enter upon a sea of speculation almost without limits, from which we could hope to bring back but little of any value to our present discussion.

It has been formally decided by various fetvas that the Koran requires belief in seven principal doctrines, and the confession of faith is this: "I believe on God, on the Angels, on the Books, on the Prophets, on the Judgment day, on the eternal Decrees of God Almighty concerning both good and evil, and on the Resurrection after death."

There are many other things which a good Moslem is expected to believe, but these points are fundamental. Taking these essential dogmas one by one we shall find that they agree with Christian doctrine in their general statement, although in their development there is a wide divergence of faith between the Christian and Moslem.

Wide Divergence of Faith.

First. The Doctrine of God This is stated by Omer Nessefi (A. D. 1142), as follows:

"God is one and eternal. He lives, and is almighty. He knows all things, hears all things, sees all things. He is endowed with will and action. He has neither form nor feature, neither bounds, limits nor numbers, neither parts, multiplications nor divisions, because He is neither body nor matter. He has neither beginning nor end. He is self-existent, without generation, dwelling or habitation. He is outside the empire of time, unequaled in His nature as in His attributes, which, without being foreign to His essence, do not constitute it."

The Westminster catechism says:

"God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth. There is but one only, the living and true God."

It will be seen that these statements differ chiefly in that the Christian gives special prominence to the moral attributes of God, and it has often been said that the God of Islam is simply a God of almighty power, while the God of Christianity is a God of infinite love and perfect holiness; but this is not a fair statement of truth. The ninety-nine names of God, which the good Moslem constantly repeats, assign these attributes to Him. The fourth name is "The Most Holy;" the twenty-ninth, "The Just;" the forty-sixth, "The All Loving;" the first and most common is "The Merciful," and the moral attributes are often referred to in the Koran. In truth, there is no conceivable perfection which the Moslem would neglect to attribute to God.

Their conception of Him is that of an absolute Oriental Monarch,

and His unlimited power to do what He pleases makes entire submission to His will the first, most prominent duty. The name which they gave to their religion implies this. It is Islam, which means submission or resignation; but a king may be good or bad, wise or foolish, and the Moslem takes as much pains as the Christian to attribute to God all wisdom and all goodness.

The essential difference in the Christian and Mohammedan conception of God lies in the fact that the Moslem does not think of this great King as having anything in common with His subjects, from whom He is infinitely removed. The idea of the incarnation of God in Christ is to them not only blasphemous but absurd and incomprehensible; and the idea of fellowship with God, which is expressed in calling Him our Father, is altogether foreign to Mohammedan thought. God is not immanent in the world in the Christian sense, but apart from the world and infinitely removed from man.

Difference in
the Conception
of God.

Second. The Doctrine of Degrees, or of the Sovereignty of God, is a fundamental principle of both Christianity and Islam.

The Koran says:

"God has from all eternity foreordained by an immutable decree all things whatsoever that come to pass, whether good or evil."

The Westminster catechism says:

"The decrees of God are His eternal purpose according to the counsel of His will, whereby for His own glory He hath foreordained whatever comes to pass."

It is plain that these two statements do not essentially differ, and the same controversies have arisen over this doctrine among Mohammedans as among Christians with the same differences of opinion.

Omer Nesseschi says:

"Predestination refers not to the temporal, but to the spiritual state. Election and reprobation decide the final fate of the soul, but in temporal affairs man is free."

A Turkish confession of faith says:

"Unbelief and wicked acts happen with the foreknowledge and will of God, but the effect of His predestination, written from eternity on the preserved tables, by His operation but not with His satisfaction. God foresees, wills, produces, loves all that is good, and does not love unbelief and sin, though He wills and effects it. If it be asked why God wills and effects what is evil and gives the devil power to tempt man, the answer is, He has His views of wisdom which it is not granted to us to know."

Many Christian theologians would accept this statement without criticism, but in general they have been careful to guard against the idea that God is in any way the efficient cause of sin, and they generally give to man a wider area of freedom than the orthodox Mohammedans.

It cannot be denied that this doctrine of the decrees of God has degenerated into fatalism more generally among Moslems than among Christians. I have never known a Mohammedan of any sect who was

not more or less a fatalist, notwithstanding the fact that there have been Moslem theologians who have repudiated fatalism as vigorously as any Christians.

In Christianity this doctrine has been offset by a different conception of God, by a higher estimate of man, and by the whole scheme of redemption through faith in Christ. In Islam there is no such counteracting influence.

Good and
Evil Angels.

Third. The other five doctrines we pass over with a single remark in regard to each. Both Moslems and Christians believe in the existence of good and evil angels, and that God has revealed His will to man in certain inspired books, and both agree that the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures are such books. The Moslem, however, believes that they have been superseded by the Koran, which was brought down from God by the angel Gabriel. They believe that this is His eternal and uncreated word; that its divine character is proved by its poetic beauty; that it has a miraculous power over men apart from what it teaches, so that the mere hearing of it, without understanding it, may heal the sick or convert the infidel. Both Christians and Moslems believe that God has sent prophets and apostles into the world to teach men His will; both believe in the judgment day and the resurrection of the dead, the immortality of the soul, and rewards and punishments in the future life.

It will be seen that in simple statement the seven positive doctrines of Islam are in harmony with Christian dogma; but in their exposition and development the New Testament and the Koran part company, and Christian and Moslem speculation evolve totally different conceptions, especially in regard to everything concerning the other world. It is in these expositions based upon the Koran (*e. g.*, suras, lvi, and lxxviii), and still more upon the traditions, that we find the most striking contrasts between Christianity and Mohammedanism; but it is not easy for a Christian to state them in a way to satisfy Moslems, and as we have no time to quote authorities we may pass them over.

Fourth. The essential dogmatic difference between Christianity and Islam is in regard to the person, office and work of Jesus Christ. The Koran expressly denies the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, His death, and the whole doctrine of the incarnation and the atonement, and rejects the sacraments which He ordained.

It accepts His miraculous birth, His miracles, His moral perfection, and His mission as an inspired prophet or teacher. It declares that He did not die on the cross, but was taken up to heaven without death, while the Jews crucified one like Him in His place. It consequently denies His resurrection from the dead, but claims that He will come again to rule the world before the day of judgment.

It says that He will Himself testify before God that He never claimed to be divine; this heresy originated with Paul.

And at the same time the faith exalts Mohammed to very nearly the same position which Christ occupies in the Christian scheme. He

is not divine, and consequently not an object of worship, but he was the first created being; God's first and best beloved, the noblest of all creatures, the mediator between God and man, the greatest intercessor, the first to enter Paradise and the highest there. Although the Koran in many places speaks of him as a sinner in need of pardon (Ex., suras xxiii, xlvii, and xlviii), his absolute sinlessness is also an article of faith.

The Holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity, is not mentioned in the Koran, and the Christian doctrine of His work of regeneration and sanctification seems to have been unknown to the prophet, who represents the Christian doctrine of the Trinity as teaching that it consists of God the Father, Mary the Mother, and Christ the Son. The promise of Christ in the Gospel of John to send the Paraclete, the Prophet applies to Himself, reading Parakletos as Periklytos, which might be rendered in Arabic as Ahmed, another form of the name Mohammed.


We have, then, in Islam a specific and final rejection and repudiation of the Christian dogma of the Incarnation and the Trinity, and the substitution of Mohammed for Christ in most of his offices, but it should be noted in passing that, while this rejection grows out of a different conception of God, it has nothing in common with the scientific rationalistic unbelief of the present day. If it cannot conceive of God as incarnate in Jesus Christ, it is not from any doubt as to His personality or His miraculous interference in the affairs of this world, or the reality of the supernatural. These ideas are fundamental to the faith of every orthodox Mohammedan, and are taught everywhere in the Koran.

There are nominal Mohammedans who are atheists, and others who are pantheists, of the Spinoza type. There are also some small sects who are rationalists, but after the fashion of old English deism rather than of the modern rationalism. The deistic rationalism is represented in that most interesting work of Justice Ameer Aali, "The Spirit of Islam." He speaks of Mohammed as Xenophon did of Socrates, and he reveres Christ also, but he denies that there was anything supernatural in the inspiration or lives of either, and claims that Hanife and the other Imams corrupted Islam as he thinks Paul, the apostle, did Christianity; but this book does not represent Mohammedanism any more than Renan's "Life of Jesus" represents Christianity. These small rationalistic sects are looked upon by all orthodox Moslems as heretics of the worst description.

Moslem Athe-
ists and Pan-
theists.

The practical and ethical relations of Islam to Christianity are even more interesting than the historical and dogmatic. The Moslem code of morals is much nearer the Christian than is generally supposed on either side, although it is really more Jewish than Christian. The truth is that we judge each other harshly and unfairly by those who do not live up to the demands of their religion, instead of comparing the pious Moslem with the consistent Christian.

We cannot enter here into a technical statement of the philosoph-



ical development of the principles of law and morality as they are given by the Imam Hanife and others. It would be incomprehensible without hours of explanation, and is really understood by but few Mohammedans, although the practical application of it is the substance of Mohammedan law. It is enough to say that the moral law is based upon the Koran, and the traditions of the life and sayings of the Prophet, enlarged by deductions and analogies. Whatever comes from these sources has the force and authority of a revealed law of God.

The first practical duties inculcated in the religious code are: Confession of God and Mohammed, His prophet; Prayer at least five times a day; Fasting during the month of Ramazan, from dawn to sunset; Alms to the annual amount of two and a half per cent on property; Pilgrimage to Mecca, at least once in a lifetime. A sixth duty, of equal importance, is taking part in sacred war, or war for religion, but some orthodox Moslems hold that this is not a perpetual obligation, and this seems to have been the opinion of Hanife.

In addition to these primary duties of religion, the moral code, as given by Omer Nessefi, demands: Honesty in business; modesty or decency in behavior; fraternity between all Moslems; benevolence and kindness toward all creatures. It forbids gambling, music, the making or possessing of images, the drinking of intoxicating liquors, the taking of God's name in vain, and all false oaths. And, in general, Omer Nessefi adds: "It is an indispensable obligation for every Moslem to practice virtue and avoid vice; *i. e.*, all that is contrary to religion, law, humanity, good manners and the duties of society. He ought especially to guard against deception, lying, slander and abuse of his neighbor."

The Moral
Code.

We may also add some specimen passages from the Koran:

"God commands justice, benevolence and liberality. He forbids crime, injustice and calumny."

"Avoid sin in secret and in public. The wicked will receive the rewards of his deeds."

"God promises His mercy and a brilliant recompense to those who add good works to their faith."

"He who commits iniquity will lose his soul."

"It is not righteousness that you turn your faces in prayer toward the east or the west; but righteousness is of him who believeth in God and the last day, and the angels and the prophets; who giveth money, for God's sake, to his kindred and to orphans, and to the needy and the stranger, and to those who ask, and for the redemption of captives; who is constant in prayer, and giveth alms; and of those who perform their covenant, and who behave themselves patiently in adversity and hardships, and in time of violence. These are they who are true, and these are they who fear God."

So far, with one or two exceptions, these conceptions of the moral life are essentially the same as the Christian, although some distinctively Christian virtues, such as meekness and humility, are not emphasized.

Beyond this we have a moral code equally binding in theory, and equally important in practice, which is not at all Christian, but is essentially the morality of the Talmud in the extreme value which it attaches to outward observances, such as fasting, pilgrimages and ceremonial rites.

All the concerns of life and death are hedged about with prescribed ceremonies, which are not simple matters of propriety, but of morality and religion; and it is impossible for one who has not lived among Moslems to realize the extent and importance of this ceremonial law.

In regard to polygamy, divorce and slavery, the morality of Islam is in direct contrast with that of Christianity, and as the principles of the faith, so far as determined by the Koran and the traditions, are fixed and unchangeable, no change in regard to the legality of these can be expected. They may be silently abandoned, but they can never be forbidden by law in any Mohammedan state. It should be said here, however, that, while the position of woman, as determined by the Koran, is one of inferiority and subjection, there is no truth whatever in the current idea that, according to the Koran, they have no souls, no hope of immortality and no rights. This is an absolutely unfounded slander.

Polygamy,
Divorce and
Slavery.

Another contrast between the morality of the Koran and the New Testament is found in the spirit with which the faith is to be propagated. The Prophet led His armies to battle and founded a temporal kingdom by force of arms. The Koran is full of exhortation to fight for the faith. Christ founded a spiritual kingdom, which could only be extended by loving persuasion and the influence of the Holy Spirit.

It is true that Christians have had their wars of religion, and have committed as many crimes against humanity in the name of Christ as Moslems have ever committed in the name of the Prophet; but the opposite teaching on this subject in the Koran and the New Testament is unmistakable, and involves different conceptions of morality.

Such, in general, is the ethical code of Islam. In practice there are certainly many Moslems whose moral lives are irreproachable according to the Christian standard, who fear God, and in their dealings with men are honest, truthful and benevolent; who are temperate in the gratification of their desires and cultivate a self-denying spirit, of whose sincere desire to do right there can be no doubt.

There are those whose conceptions of pure spiritual religions seem to rival those of the Christian mystics. This is specially true of one or two sects of Dervishes. Some of these sects are simply Mohammedan Neo-Platonists, and deal in magic, sorcery and purely physical means of attaining a state of ecstasy; but others are neither pantheists nor theosophists, and seek to attain unity of spirit with a supreme, personal God by spiritual means.

Those who have had much acquaintance with Moslems know that in addition to these mystics there are many common people—as many women as men—who seem to have more or less clear ideas of spiritual life and strive to attain something higher than mere formal morality

and verbal confession; who feel their personal unworthiness, and hope only in God.

The following extract from one of many similar poems of Shereef Hanum, a Turkish Moslem lady of Constantnople, rendered into English by Rev. H. O. Dwight, is certainly as spiritual in thought and language as most of the hymns sung in Christian churches:

"O Source of Kindness and of Love
Who givest aid all hopes above,
'Mid grief and guilt although I grope,
From Thee I'll ne'er cut off my hope.
My Lord, O my Lord!

Thou King of kings, dost know my need,
Thy pardoning grace no bars can heed;
Thou lov'st to help the helpless one,
And bidd'st his cries of fear be done.
My Lord, O my Lord!

Should'st Thou refuse to still my fears,
Who else will stop to dry my tears?
For I am guilty, guilty still,
No other one has done so ill.
My Lord, O my Lord!

The lost in torment stand aghast
To see this rebel's sin so vast;
What wonder, then, that Shereef cries
For mercy, mercy, e'er she dies.
My Lord, O my Lord!"

Spiritual Life
Attained.

These facts are important, not as proving that Mohammedanism is a spiritual faith in the same sense as Christianity, for it is not, but as showing that many Moslems do attain some degree, at least, of what Christians mean by spiritual life; while, as we must confess, it is equally possible for Christianity to degenerate into mere formalism.

Notwithstanding the generally high tone of the Moslem code of morals, and the more or less Christian experience of spiritually minded Mohammedans, I think that the chief distinction between Christian and Moslem morality lies in their different conceptions of the nature and consequences of sin.

It is true that most of the theories advanced by Christian writers on theoretical ethics have found defenders among the Moslems; but Mohammedan law is based on the theory that right and wrong depend on legal enactment, and Mohammedan thought follows the same direction. An act is right because God has commanded it, or wrong because He has forbidden it. God may abrogate or change His laws, so that what was wrong may become right. Moral acts have no inherent moral character, and what may be wrong for one may be right for another. So, for example, it is impossible to discuss the moral character of the prophet with an orthodox Moslem, because it is a sufficient answer to any criticism to say that God commanded or expressly permitted those acts which in other men would be wrong.

There is, however, one sin which is in its very nature sinful, and

which man is capable of knowing to be such; that is, the sin of denying that there is one God, and that Mohammed is His prophet. Everything else depends on the arbitrary command of God, and may be arbitrarily forgiven; but this does not, and is consequently unpardonable. For whoever dies in this sin there is no possible escape from eternal damnation.

Grave and
Light Sins.

Of other sins some are grave and some are light, and it must not be supposed that the Moslem regards grave sins as of little consequence. He believes that sin is rebellion against infinite power, and that it cannot escape the notice of the all-seeing God, but must call down His wrath upon the sinner; so that even a good Moslem may be sent to hell to suffer torment for thousands of years before he is pardoned.

But he believes that God is merciful; that "he is minded to make his religion light, because man has been created weak." (Koran, sura 4.) If man has sinned against His arbitrary commands, God may arbitrarily remit the penalty, on certain conditions, on the intercession of the Prophet, on account of the expiatory acts on the man's part or in view of counterbalancing good works. At the worst, the Moslem will be sent to hell for a season and then be pardoned, out of consideration for his belief in God and the Prophet by divine mercy. Still, we need to repeat, the Moslem does not look upon sin as a light thing.

But, notwithstanding this conception of the danger of sinning against God, the Mohammedan is very far from comprehending the Christian idea that right and wrong are inherent qualities in all moral actions; that God Himself is a moral being, doing what is right because it is right, and that He can no more pardon sin arbitrarily than He can make a wrong action right; that He could not be just and yet justify the sinner without the atonement made by the incarnation and the suffering and the death of Jesus Christ.

They do not realize that sin itself is corruption and death; that mere escape from hell is not eternal life, but that the sinful soul must be regenerated and sanctified by the work of the Holy Spirit before it can know the joy of beatific vision.

Whether I have correctly stated the fundamental difference between the Christian and Mohammedan conceptions of sin, no one who has had Moslem friends can have failed to realize that the difference exists, for it is extremely difficult, almost impossible, for Christians and Moslems to understand one another when the question of sin is discussed. There seems to be a hereditary incapacity in the Moslem to comprehend this essential basis of Christian morality.

Mohammedan morality is also differentiated from the Christian by its fatalistic interpretation of the doctrine of the Decrees. The Moslem who reads in the Koran, "As for every man we have firmly fixed his fate about his neck," and the many similar passages, who is taught that at least so far as the future life is concerned his fate has been fixed from eternity by an arbitrary and irrevocable decree, naturally falls into fatalism; not absolute fatalism, for the Moslem, as we

Doctrine of
the Decrees.

have seen, has his strict code of morality and his burdensome ceremonial law, but at least such a measure of fatalism as weakens his sense of personal responsibility, and leaves him to look upon the whole Christian scheme of redemption as unnecessary, if not absurd.

Will and Desire.

It is perhaps also due to the fatalistic tendency of Mohammedan thought that the Moslem has a very different conception from the Christian of the relation of the will to the desires and passions. He does not distinguish between them, but regards will and desire as one and the same, and seeks to avoid temptation rather than resist it. Of conversion, in the Christian sense, he has no conception—of that change of heart which makes the regenerated will the master of the soul, to dominate its passions, control the desires and lead men on to final victory over sin and death.

Influence of the Prophet's Life.

There is one other point concerning Mohammedan morality of which I wish to speak with all possible delicacy, but which cannot be passed over in silence. It is the influence of the prophet's life upon that of his followers. The Moslem world accepts him, as Christians do Christ, as the ideal man, the best beloved of God, and consequently their conception of his life exerts an important influence upon their practical morality.

I have said nothing, thus far, of the personal character of the prophet, because it is too difficult a question to discuss in this connection; but I may say, in a word, that my own impression is that, from first to last, he sincerely and honestly believed himself to be a supernaturally inspired prophet of God. I have no wish to think any evil of him, for he was certainly one of the most remarkable men that the world has ever seen. I should rejoice to know that he was such a man as he is represented to be in Ameer Aali's "Spirit of Islam," for the world would be richer for having such a man in it.

But whatever may have been his real character, he is known to Moslems chiefly through the traditions; and these, taken as a whole, present to us a totally different man from the Christ of the Gospels. As we have seen, the Moslem code of morals commands and forbids essentially the same things as the Christian; but the Moslem finds in the traditions a mass of stories in regard to the life and sayings of the prophet, many of which are altogether inconsistent with Christian ideas of morality, and which make the impression that many things forbidden are at least excusable.

There are many nominal Christians who lead lives as corrupt as any Moslems, but they find no excuse for it in the life of Christ. They know that they are Christians only in name; while, under the influence of the traditions, the Mohammedan may have such a conception of the prophet that, in spite of his immorality, he may still believe himself a true Moslem. If Moslems generally believed in such a prophet as is described in the "Spirit of Islam," it would greatly modify the tone of Mohammedan life.

We have now presented, as briefly and impartially as possible, the

points of contact and contrast between Christianity and Islam, as historical, dogmatic and ethical.

We have seen that while there is a broad, common ground of belief and sympathy, while we may confidently believe as Christians that God is leading many pious Moslems by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and saving them through the atonement of Jesus Christ, in spite of what we believe to be their errors of doctrine, these two religions are still mutually exclusive and irreconcilable.

Mutually Exclusive.

The general points of agreement are that we both believe that there is one supreme, personal God; that we are bound to worship Him; that we are under obligation to live a pious, virtuous life; that we are bound to repent of our sins and forsake them; that the soul is immortal, and that we shall be rewarded or punished in the future life for our deeds here; that God has revealed His will to the world through prophets and apostles, and that the Holy Scriptures are the word of God.

These are most important grounds of agreement and mutual respect, but the points of contrast are equally impressive.

The supreme God of Christianity is immanent in the world, was incarnate in Christ, and is ever seeking to bring His children into loving fellowship with Himself.

The God of Islam is apart from the world, an absolute monarch, who is wise and merciful, but infinitely removed from man.

Christianity recognizes the freedom of man, and magnifies the guilt and corruption of sin, but at the same time offers a way of reconciliation and redemption from sin and its consequences through the atonement of a Divine Saviour and regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

Mohammedanism minimizes the freedom of man and the guilt of sin, makes little account of its corrupting influence in the soul and offers no plan of redemption except that of repentance and good works.

Christianity finds its ideal man in the Christ of the Gospels; the Moslem finds his in the Prophet of the Koran and the Traditions.

Other points of contrast have been mentioned, but the fundamental difference between the two religions is found in these.

This is not the place to discuss the probable future of these two great and aggressive religions, but there is one fact bearing upon this point which comes within the scope of this paper. Christianity is essentially progressive, while Mohammedanism is unprogressive and stationary.

In their origin Christianity and Islam are both Asiatic, both Semitic, and Jerusalem is but a few hundred miles from Mecca. In regard to the number of their adherents, both have steadily increased from the beginning to the present day. After 1,900 years Christianity numbers 400,000,000, and Islam, after 1,300 years, 200,000,000; but Mohammedanism has been practically confined to Asia and Africa, while Christianity has been the religion of Europe and the New World, and politically it rules over all the world, except China and Turkey.

Future of the Two Religions.

Mohammedanism has been identified with a stationary civilization, and Christianity with a progressive one. There was a time from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries, when science and philosophy flourished at Bagdad and Cordova under Moslem rule, while darkness reigned in Europe; but Renan has shown that this brilliant period was neither Arab nor Mohammedan in its spirit or origin; and although his statements may admit of some modification, it is certain that, however brilliant while it lasted, this period has left no trace in the Moslem faith, unless it be in the philosophical basis of Mohammedan law, while Christianity has led the way in the progress of modern civilization.


Both these are positive religions. Each claims to rest upon a divine revelation, which is, in its nature, final and unchangeable; yet the one is stationary and the other progressive. The one is based upon what it believes to be divine commands, and the other upon divine principles; just the difference that there is between the law of Sinai and the law of Love, the Ten Commandments and the two. The ten are specific and unchangeable; the two admit of ever new and progressive application.

Whether in prayer or in search of truth, the Moslem must always turn his face to Mecca and to a revelation made once for all to the prophet; and I think that Moslems generally take pride in the feeling that their faith is complete in itself, and as unchangeable as Mount Ararat. It cannot progress because it is already perfect.

The Christian, on the other hand, believes in a living Christ, who was indeed crucified at Jerusalem, but rose from the dead and is now present everywhere, leading His people on to ever broader and higher conceptions of truth, and ever new applications of it to the life of humanity; and the Christian church, with some exceptions, perhaps, recognizes the fact that the perfection of its faith consists not in its immobility but in its adaptability to every stage of human enlightenment. If progress is to continue to be the watchword of civilization, the faith which is to dominate this civilization must also be progressive.

It would have been pleasant to speak here today only of the broad field of sympathy which these two great religions occupy in common, but it would have been as unjust to the Moslem as to the Christian. If I have represented his faith as fairly as I have sought to do, he will be the first to applaud.

No true Moslem or Christian believes that these two great religions are essentially the same, or that they can be merged by compromise in a common eclectic faith. We know that they are mutually exclusive, and it is only by a fair and honest comparison of differences that we can work together for the many ends which we have in common, or judge of the truth in those things in which we differ.



Tombs of the Mamluks.

America's Duty to China

Paper by DR. W. A. P. MARTIN, of Peking, China



AMONG the hundreds of inviting themes offered in the official programme, I have selected this because it is pregnant with live issues, and because in a parliament of religions no subject is more fitting than that of duty. A religion that withdraws men from the active duties of life and leads them to consume their brief span of earthly existence in fruitless contemplation, or one that exalts ceremonial observances, at the expense of justice and charity, has forgotten the mission of a heaven-sent faith. The seal of religion is the sanction which it lends to morality. This is what St. James means when he says that "pure and undefiled religion is to visit the widow and the fatherless in their affliction; and to keep one's self unspotted from the world." The same conception is set forth in the eighty-fifth psalm, in that beautiful picture of heaven and earth combining to give birth to truth, mercy and righteousness:

"Mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth springeth out of the earth. Righteousness hath looked down from heaven."

There is not a religion worthy of the name that does not in some degree exert this kind of elevating and sanctifying influence. But it is not claiming too much for Christianity to assert that beyond all other systems it has made its influence felt in the morality of individuals and of nations. It is like the sun, which not only floods the earth with light, but imparts the force that enables her to pursue her pathway. It has been well said "that it is one of the glories of Christianity that it has caused the sentiment of repentance to find a place in the heart of nations." This is the sentiment that I desire to evoke, and I trust that the views presented in this paper will in some measure contribute to the promotion of a public opinion, which will not merely check the prevailing tendency to private and legislative outrage on our Chinese neighbors, but stimulate to increased efforts for the promotion of their

*Influence of
Christianity.*

welfare. "The duty of nations," says Montesquieu, "is, in peace to do good to each other, and in war to do as little harm as possible;"—a maxim which expresses the essence of Christian ethics, and one which could not have sprung up in any other than a Christian soil.

Our Indebted-
ness to China

Before taking up the discussion of our specific duties let us for a moment take a view of our indebtedness to China. The word duty in its primary sense signifies what we owe. Gathering a fullness of meaning and rising with the growth of morals and the development of language, it finally attains the conception of what we ought, signifying in the first instance an obligation to make a return for benefits received, and in its higher sense that which we are impelled to do from any consideration that binds the conscience. In either sphere we shall discover a number of weighty obligations which we have to discharge toward the people of China.

To begin with those of the lower order—our obligations for benefits received: Rich are the gifts which that ancient empire has poured into the lap of our western civilization; gifts, which like air and sunshine, we enjoy without taking the trouble to reflect on their origin, though their withdrawal would carry a sense of grievous loss into every household. Here, where the products of inventive genius are so profoundly displayed, let it not be forgotten that to China we are indebted for the best of our domestic beverages; for the elegant ware that adorns our table, and for those splendid dress materials that set off the beauty of our women.

To China, moreover, we are indebted for at least one of our sciences, one which is doing more than any other to transform and subjugate the elements. For, as I have shown in a paper devoted to that inquiry, alchemy, the mother of our modern chemistry, though reaching Europe by way of India, Byzantium and Arabia, had its original root in the Chinese philosophy of Tao, one of the religions represented here today. Its votaries, seizing on a hint of the transmutations of matter which they found in that oldest of the sacred books two thousand years ago, of their country, the Yi King or Book of Changes, not only conceived the idea of obtaining gold from baser metals, but came to believe in the possibility of evolving from this perishable body an imperishable spiritual existence. Thus, at that early date, we find among the Chinese the search for the secret of making gold and compounding the elixir of immortality—the twin pursuits that have fired the ambition of alchemists in all subsequent ages.

Are not these few items, if taken alone, sufficient to warrant the inference that the nation which originated such things is not undeserving of respect, as a benefactor of the human race?

But I hasten to emphasize another obligation which connects itself directly with the great event commemorated by this Columbian exhibition. For to China, beyond a doubt, we are indebted for the motive that stimulated the Genoese navigator to undertake his adventurous voyage, and to her he was indebted for the needle that guided him on his way. Being an Italian, he was familiar with the marvelous narra-

tive of Marco Polo's residence at the court of Kublai Khan (A. D. 1280), in Combalar, the present city of Peking. His imagination was filled with the splendors of Cathay, the name that Polo gives to China from the Kitai Mongols, to whose sway it was then subject; and be it remembered, that at that epoch Europe was far in the wake of China, both in wealth and civilization, her only pre-eminence consisting in the possession of those undeveloped germs of religion and science which since that day have transformed the globe.

The Motive
that Stimulat-
ed Columbus.

The doctrine of the earth's rotundity, which was not new, but which he was the first to make subservient to maritime enterprise, assured Columbus that the ocean, on which he looked, must have a farther shore, and that by crossing it to the west he might arrive at the Asiatic Eldorado after passing the island empire of Zipangu, never dreaming that the ocean held in its bosom a new world, which stretched almost from pole to pole and barred his westward course.

Convinced as he was that by steering to the west he might arrive at that land of wealth and culture, without the aid of the mariner's compass he would have been powerless to pursue such course. Indeed, but for the assistance of that mysterious pilot, he never would have dared to leave behind him coast and headland, and to plunge into a vast unknown where clouds and fogs might deprive him of sun and stars.

"Long lay the ocean paths from him concealed;
Light came from heaven, the magnet was revealed.
Then first Columbus, with the grasping hand
Of mighty genius, weighed the sea and land.
There seemed one waste of waters—long in vain
His spirit brooded on the Atlantic main,
When sudden, as creation burst from naught,
Sprang a new world through his stupendous thought."

This heaven-sent helper came to him, as already intimated, by way of China; for it was to the Chinese that the directive properties of the magnet were first "revealed." Long before the dawn of the Christian era they had made use of it in crossing the treeless prairies of Mongolia and the moving sands of the desert of Cobi. Early in our era they had applied it to coastwise navigation, and nothing was wanting but a Chinese Columbus to enable them to find their way across the Pacific and to pre-occupy this goodly continent, which by a special Providence appears to have been reserved for the people of Europe.

We know not the hand by which the magic needle was transmitted, but it is morally certain that it came from China, where it had made its home for at least two thousand years. There is, indeed, an apparent difference between our needle and that of China, which might in some minds give rise to a doubt as to their identity. The Chinese always speak of theirs as "pointing to the south," while it is well known that ours points in the opposite direction. Matter this for a pretty controversy—which might not have been easily settled, but for the fortunate observation that a needle has two ends. May not this case serve as a hint to help us in reconciling some of our conflicts

of religious opinion? Does it not show that both parties may be right, though the divergency of their views appears to be as wide as the poles?

Gave us the
Compass.

Significant it is that the first European known to have employed the compass was Gioja, a Neapolitan, a countryman of Polo's and those other enterprising Italians, who brought the news of China from the ports of the Euxine or sought them in Tartary. Not merely did Polo's story awaken the aspirations of Columbus, the needle itself spoke to him of China, seeming to say, "fear not the trackless ocean; here is a guide that I have sent you to conduct you to my shores." In Irving's "Tales of the Alhambra," one of the Moorish kings comes into possession of a wonderful talisman—the image of a cavalier whose spear is endowed with the inestimable quality of always pointing, in the direction from which danger is to be apprehended. Would not the magnetic needle, if only one of the kind had existed, have been regarded as equally mysterious? Is it worthy of less admiration, because capable of being indefinitely multiplied? And is our debt to China the lighter because the instrument she has given us, after having unveiled a hidden continent, continues to direct the movement of our ocean commerce?


In a word, without China for motive and without the magic finger for guide, it is certain that Columbus would not have made his voyage; and it is highly probable that we should not have been holding a World's Fair at this time and place. With such claims on our grateful recognition is it not a matter of surprise that China is not found occupying a conspicuous place in this Columbian exhibition? Could anything have been more fitting than to have had the dragon flag floating over a pavilion draped with shining silks, with a pyramid of tea chests on one hand, and on the other a house of porcelain surmounted by a gigantic compass and a statue of China beckoning Columbus to cross the seas?

As a matter of form, our government did send an invitation to China, as to other countries, to participate in a national capacity. To Chinese eyes it read like this:

"We have excluded your laborers and skilled workmen because our people dread their competition. We have even enacted a law that not one of them who turns his back on our shores shall be permitted to re-enter our ports. Still we would like to have you help us with our big show, and for this occasion we are willing to relax the rigor of our rules so far as to admit a few of your workmen to aid in arranging your exhibit, under bond, be it understood, that they shall clear out as soon as the display is over."

What wonder that a proud and sensitive government declined the tempting offer, leaving its industries to be represented (if at all) by the private enterprise of its people resident in the United States?

Here is China's official reply as communicated by Minister Denby in a dispatch to the Secretary of State. Reporting an interview with the Chinese premier, Li Hung Chong, he says:



"I then took up the subject of the Chicago exposition and advised him to send a fleet to Hampton Roads to show the world the great progress China has lately made in the creation of a modern navy. I found, however, that it was useless to argue the subject with him. He said he would not send a fleet, and that China would have no exhibition at Chicago. I expressed my regret at this irrational conclusion and used some arguments to make him recede from it, but without avail."

If our indebtedness to China is such that nothing but ignorance or want of thought could prevent its due recognition; on the other hand our duties to her and her people are not less conspicuous. In treating of them I shall not attempt to carry out the form of a debt and credit account; for though our sense of moral responsibility may sometimes be quickened by sentimental considerations, such as those to which we have adverted, our duties are of a higher order and more positive character. They grow not out of obligation for benefits, such as we have described, but spring directly from the geographical situation, which the Creator has assigned to us, taken in connection with the position which we are called to occupy in the scale of civilization.

"Who is my neighbor?" is a question which every human soul is bound to ask in a world in which mutual aid is the first of moral laws. The answer given by Him who, better than any other, expounded and exemplified the laws of God, is applicable to nations as well as to individuals. It is an answer that sweeps away the barriers of race and religion and shows us the Samaritan forgetful of hereditary feuds ministering to the wants of the needy Jew.

"Who is my Neighbor?"

Thus China is our neighbor, notwithstanding the sea that rolls between us, a sea which, contrary to the idea of the Roman poet, unites rather than divides. Yes, China, which faces us on the opposite shore of the Pacific; China, which occupies a domain as vast and as opulent in resources as our own; China, teeming with a population five times as great as ours and more accessible to us than to any of the great nations of Christendom; China, I say, is pre-eminently our neighbor.

What, then, is the first of the duties which we owe to her? It is unquestionably to make her people partakers with ourselves in the blessings of the Christian religion. Here in this parliament of religions it is unnecessary to stop to prove that religion is our chief good, and that every man who feels himself to be in possession of a clew to guide him through the labyrinth of earthly evils, is bound to offer it to his brother man. Who can deny that we may derive a great advantage from the comparison of our religious experience? And who that believes that (in Buddhistic phrase) "he has found the way out of the bitter sea" can refuse to indicate the path to his brother man? The latter may decline to follow it, but that is his lookout; he may even feel offended by an implied assumption of superiority, but ought a regard for susceptibilities of that sort to disperse us from the duty of imparting our knowledge?

"Why should we not send religions to your country?" once said to me a distinguished Chinese professor in the Imperial University of Peking. Careful not to say that it was "because water does not flow up hill," I replied: "By all means, send them and make the experiment."

"But would your people receive them with favor?" he asked again.

"Certainly," said I; "instead of being a voice crying in the wilderness they would be welcomed to our city halls and their message would be heard and weighed."

Do you suppose that my esteemed colleague at once set about forming a missionary society? He was proud of his position as professor of mathematics, and proud to be the expositor of what he called "western learning," but his faith was too feeble to prompt to effort for the propagation of his religion. He was a Confucianist and believed in an over-ruling power, which he called "Shangti" or "Tien," and had some shadow of notion of a life to come, as evidenced by his worship of ancestors; but his religion, such as it was, was woefully wanting in vitality, and marked by that Sadduceean indifference which may be taken as the leading characteristic of his school despite the excellence of its ethical system.

Taoism Indigenous to China. Another religion indigenous to China is Taoism; but as the Chinese say of their famous Book of Changes, that "it cannot be carried beyond the seas," we may say the same of Taoism; it has nothing that will bear transportation. Its founder, Lao Tsze, did, indeed, express some sublime truths in beautiful language; but he enjoined retirement from the world rather than persistent effort to improve mankind. His followers have become sadly degenerate; and not to speak of alchemy, which they continue to pursue, their religion has dwindled into a compound of necromancy and exorcism. It is, however, very far from being dead.

It has at its head a pontiff who represents a hierarchy as old as the Christian era. From his palace on the Tunghn mountains, of Kionsi, he exercises a serious sort of spiritual jurisdiction over everything in the empire, the tutelar deity of the city being by him selected from a list of dead Mondouins. He is supposed, moreover, to be able to control all the bad spirits that molest mankind, and the visitor is shown long rows of jars, each bearing the seal of the pontiff and an inscription indicating that some culprit spirit was there confined. Such is Taoism at the present day, and though it exercises a tremendous power over the minds of the superstitious, its doctrines and methods would hardly be deemed edifying in other parts of the world.

Buddhism has a nobler record. It imported into China the elements of a spiritual conception of the universe. It has implanted in the minds of the common people a firm belief in rewards and punishments. It has cherished a spirit of charity; and in a word, exercised an influence so similar to that of Christianity that it may be considered

as having done much to prepare the soil for the dissemination of a higher faith. But its force is spent and its work done. Its priesthood has lapsed into such a state of ignorance and corruption that in Chinese Buddhism there appears to be no possibility of revival. In fact, it seems to exist in a state of suspended animation similar to that of those frogs that are said to have been excavated from the stones of a Buddhist monument in India, which inhaling a breath of air took a leap or two and then expired. Of the Buddhism of Japan, which appears to be more wide-awake, it is not my province to speak; but as to that of China there is reason to fear that no power can galvanize it even into a semblance of vitality.

The religion of the state is a heterogeneous cult made up of ceremonies borrowed from each of these three systems. And of the religion of the people, it may be affirmed that it consists of parts of all three commingled in each individual mind, much as gases are mingled in the atmosphere, but without any definite proportion. Each of these systems has, in its measure, served them as a useful discipline, though in jarring and irreconcilable discord with each other. But the time has come for the Chinese to be introduced to a more complete religion, one which combines the merits of all three, while it heightens them in degree.

Religion of
the State.

To the august character of Shangti, the Supreme Ruler, known but neglected, feared but not loved, Christianity will add the attraction of a tender Father—bringing Him into each heart and house in lieu of the fetiches now enshrined there. Instead of Buddha, the light of Asia, it will give them Christ, the "Light of the world," for the faint hopes of immortality derived from Taoist discipline or Buddhist transmigration it will confer a faith that triumphs over death and the grave; and to crown all, bestow on them the energy of the Holy Ghost quickening the conscience and sanctifying the affections as nothing else has ever done.

The native systems, bound up with the absurdities of geomancy and the abominations of animal worship, are an anachronism in the age of steamboats and telegraphs. When electricity has come forth from its hiding place to link the remotest quarters of their land in instantaneous sympathy, ministering light, force and healing, does it not suggest to them the coming of a spiritual energy to do the same for the human soul?

This spiritual power I hold it is pre-eminently the duty of Americans to seek to impart to the people of China. When Christianity comes to them from Russia, England or France, all of which have pushed their territories up to the frontiers of China, the Chinese are prone to suspect that evangelization under such auspices is only a mask for future aggression. It is not Christianity in itself that they object to, so much as its connection with foreign power and foreign politics.

Now these impediments are minimized in the case of the United States, a country which, until the outbreak of this unhappy persecu-

tion of their countrymen, was regarded by the Chinese as their best friend, because an impossible enemy. Our treaty of 1858 gives expression to this feeling by a clause inserted at the instance of the Chinese negotiators to the effect that whenever China finds herself in a difficulty with another foreign power she shall have the right to call on America to make use of her good offices to effect a settlement. America holds that proud position no longer. To such a pass have things come that a viceroy, who has always been friendly and at times has been regarded as a patron of missionaries, not long ago said to an American missionary: "Do not come back to China. Stay in your own country and teach your people the practice of justice and charity."

Duties Incumbent upon our Government.

This brings us to the duties especially incumbent on our government, and the first that suggests itself is that of protecting American interests. That, you may say, is not a duty to China, but one that it owes to its own people. True, but Americans have no interest that does not imply a corresponding good to the Chinese empire.

Take, for example, our commerce. Do we impoverish China by taking her teas and silks? Do we not, on the contrary, add to her wealth by giving in exchange the materials for food and clothing at a less cost than would be required for their production in China? The value of our commercial interests in that empire may be inferred better than from any minute statistics from the fact that within the last thirty years they have been a leading factor in the construction of four lines of railway spanning this continent and of three lines of steamships bridging the Pacific. What dimensions will they not attain when our states west of the Mississippi come to be filled with an opulent population, and when the resources of China are developed by the application of occidental methods?

Had Columbus realized the grandness of his discovery, and had he, like Balboa, bathed in the waters of the Pacific, what a picture would have risen before the eye of his fervid imagination? A new land as rich as Cathay, and new and old clasping hands across a broad expanse of ocean whitened by the sails of a prosperous commerce. Already has such a dream begun to be fulfilled, and to the prospective expansion of our commerce fancy can hardly assign a limit. In that bright reversion every son of our soil and every adopted citizen has a direct or indirect interest.

But what has the government to do with all that beyond giving free scope to private enterprise? Much in many ways. But not to descend into particulars, its responsibility consists mainly in two things, both negative, viz., not by an injudicious tariff to exclude the products of China from our markets, and not to divert the trade of China into European channels by planting a bitter root of hostility in the Chinese.

Let the Christian people of the United States rise up in their might and demand that our government shall retrace its steps, by repealing that odious law which may not be forbidden by the letter of our constitution, but which three eminent members of our supreme

court have pronounced to be in glaring opposition to the spirit of our magna charta.


In September, 1888, the Chinese government had under advisement a treaty negotiated by its minister in Washington in which, to escape the indignity of an arbitrary exclusion act, it agrees to take the initiative in prohibiting the emigration of laborers. That treaty would undoubtedly have been ratified if time had been given for the consideration of amendments which China desired to propose. But the exigencies of a presidential campaign led our government to apply the "closure" with an abruptness almost unheard of in diplomatic history, demanding through our minister in Peking the ratification within forty-eight hours on pain of being considered as having rejected the treaty. The Chinese government, not choosing to sacrifice its dignity by complying with this unceremonious ultimatum, our congress, as a bid for a vote of the Pacific coast, hastily passed the Scott law, a law which our supreme court has decided to be in contravention of our treaty engagements.

Another Olympiad came around, a term which we might very well apply to the periodical game of electing a president, and on the high tide of another presidential contest a new exclusion law, surpassing its predecessors in the severity of its enactments, was successfully floated. Could such a course have any other effect than that of exciting in the mind of China a profound contempt for our republican institutions, and an abiding hostility toward our people? One of our leading journals has characterized that law as "a piece of buncombe and barbarous legislation," of which the administration would appear to be "heartily ashamed," to judge from the excuse they find for evading its execution.

Ashamed of
the Geary Law.

Let a wise diplomacy supersede these obnoxious enactments by a new convention which shall be fair to both parties; then will our people be welcomed as friends; and America may yet recover her lost influence in that great empire of the East.





Procession of the Holy Carpet to Mecca.

Religion of Peking.

Paper by ISAAC T. HEADLAND, of the Peking University.



THE Chinese are often supposed to be so poor, that, even if they wished, they would not be able to support Christianity were it established in their midst. Such a supposition is a great mistake. Not to mention the fact that they are at present supporting four religions, viz., Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism and Mohammedanism, a glance at the condition of any city or village is enough to convince one of the fact that, whatever the Chinese wish to do and undertake to do, they are abundantly able to do.

The country swarms with people—poor people—people who are so very poor that there are, no doubt, thousands who starve every year. It is said that just outside of the Chien

Men gate, which stands immediately in front of the emperor's palace, more than 400 people froze to death during a single night during the past winter. In front of this gate is a bridge called Beggars' bridge, where half naked men and boys may be seen at any time, except when the emperor himself passes, eating food which would not be eaten by a respectable American dog. But while this is all true, it does not alter the fact that there are more temples in Peking than there are churches in Chicago. There are temples of all sorts and sizes, from the little altar built outside the door of the watchman's house on the top of the city wall, to the great Lama temple, which covers many acres of ground, having an idol of Buddha 100 feet tall and 1,500 priests to conduct the worship. Similar to this great Buddhist temple is the great Confucian temple, not so large, and without priests, but equally well built and well kept. The large Taoist temple, immediately outside of the west side gate, is expensive and well supported and contains many priests, while the large grounds of the Mohammedans with their twenty-one mosques is worthy to be ranked with those above mentioned.

Temples of all sorts.

Professor Headland had a series of pictures of scenes and inci

dents among the districts of temples in and about Peking, and his address explained these pictures. He then said:

Temples About
Peking.

"Besides these, the temple of the sun, the temple of the moon, the temple of the earth, the temple of heaven and the temple of agriculture are all immense structures of the most costly type. These are all state temples, where the emperor performs worship for all the people, and the annual sacrifices of cattle and sheep are by no means inexpensive. There are few churches in the United States which cost more than \$500,000, but some of those I have just mentioned would far exceed, if not more than double, that amount. The Roman Catholics have shown their wisdom in erecting cathedrals, which, though not so expensive, far surpass the others in beauty, design and workmanship. They have three very fine cathedrals, the east, the south and the north, the last of which would be an ornament to any city in the United States."

The following translation of the inscription on two tablets at the mouth of a cave called Hermit's cave will show how temples are sometimes repaired. The cave is eight feet square and four and a half feet high, and is cut out of the solid rock:

"On this stone is recorded the restoration of the idols and the rebuilding of the temple Dung Ching Au on this mountain, Tsui Wei Shan. By whom this temple was originally built many years ago is unknown. A number of eunuchs of the emperor's palace have contributed to its entire restoration, and now that the work is completed the buildings, idols and Lo Han fully restored, I make this record that the merit of these generous men may be known to future generations. I, Chas Yu, chamberlain of the emperor's palace, make this record, inscribing first the names of the forty largest donors, Ming Dynasty, Wau Li, emperor."

The number of temples in the city that are entirely out of repair is not small. In the purchase of our mission premises we become the possessors of no less than three temples, while one stands at our southwest and another at our northwest corner, another at the southwest of our W. F. M. S. property, another in front of our hospital gate and still another near a large well back of our houses.

The first one purchased has been turned into a dining-room for the preparatory school of the Peking university. When the workmen came to take the gods out of this temple they first invited them to go out, and then carried them out. When we made our second purchase one of the priests walled himself up in one corner, tied a rope to a large bell, and declared that he would never leave the place. He kept ringing the bell at intervals for some time, but this after a while became so monotonous that he took opium for the purpose of committing suicide. Our physician was called, and, by administering the proper remedies, he was saved and eventually left. Our third temple was turned into a charity school last winter, in which seventeen small boys are studying the catechism and other Christian books, and Durbin hall takes the place of the temples.

All sorts of stratagem are resorted to by the priests to secure patronage. I have heard of an old priest whose temple was rapidly falling into decay who, after thinking of many ways, settled upon the following scheme:

Having made arrangements with an old woman, he sent her away from the temple some distance and persuaded her to buy a donkey and ride to the temple. She did so. Dismounting, she left the donkey and driver outside while she entered the temple. Not returning for a long time, the driver became impatient and made a disturbance about his pay. Hereupon the priest entered in the midst of the crowd that had gathered and asked what was the matter. When told, he said that it was impossible, that no old woman had come into the temple, and invited the driver to go and examine. He led him in among the genii which were arranged around the building and the driver soon picked out the right one.

Stratagem for
Patronage.

"But," said the priest, "this is not an old woman, this is one of the gods; fall down and worship her and she will give you your money."

He did so and to his surprise found a piece of silver on the ground where he knelt. When he returned to the donkey he found a string of cash on its back. He began at once to spread the news. The people went to worship and many of them found silver. The news spread, the money poured into the temple treasury, and the crowd so increased about the temple that the government was forced to interfere.

Whether or not it may be considered a misfortune that the Buddhist priests are a company of beggars is perhaps largely a matter of opinion. Buddhism was established by a prince, who became a beggar that he might teach his people the way to enlightenment, and they are but following his illustrious example. But while they follow in the matter of begging—at least a large part of them—there is no room for much doubt as to whether most of them make a very strenuous effort to enlighten the people. Indeed, if all the facts brought to light in our foreign hospitals, especially those situated near the Lama temples and visited by the priests, were set forth, they would reveal a condition of things among the class of priests not very different, perhaps, from that which called forth Paul's epistle to the Corinthians. But these facts are of such a character as to be fit only for a medical report.

It need not be considered a matter of wonder, then, that the morals of the people are not better than they are. "Like priest, like people." Says Chaucer:

Like Priest,
Like People.

"For if a priest be foul, on whom we trust,
No wonder it is a lewid man to ruste."

And it is by no means a matter of doubt that a large number of Buddhist priests are "foul." They are not all so. We have seen among them faces which carry their own tale; we have heard voices which carry their own recommendations, and we have seen conduct which could only proceed from a devoted heart. But of those with whom we have come in contact, this class has been the exception, not the rule. At Miao Feng Shan, a large temple situated above the clouds,

the priests themselves, I have been told by a Chinese teacher, support a company of prostitutes. Certain it is, that at the most prosperous of the temples are found some of the worst priests, as though when the getting of money for their support was off their minds, having little left to occupy them, they entertain themselves by the gratification of their passions. They may, however, like many other priests, be misrepresented by their own people.

Prosperous
Temples.

By "the most prosperous temples" we mean those to which the most pilgrimages are made. Miao Feng Shan is forty miles west of Peking, and another fifty miles east is almost equally popular. To these in the springtime many thousands of people from all the surrounding country make pilgrimages, some of which are of the most expensive and self-denying character, while others exhibit almost every form of humiliation and self-torment, such as wearing chains as prisoners, tying their feet together so as to be able to take only short steps, being chained to another man, wearing red clothing in exhibition of their sin, or prostrating themselves at every one, three, or five steps.

The temple worship of the Jews at its most prosperous period was not more largely attended than is this worship at these temples. While the temples are enriched by the gifts or subscriptions of these worshippers, they are, at the same time, robbed by those "pious frauds" who are ready at all times to sell their souls for the sake of their bodies. At Miao Feng Shan they give candles at the foot of the hill to those pilgrims who arrive at night to enable them to ascend the hill. Here these pious frauds (sham pilgrims) get their candles, ascend the hill at a little distance; then by a circuitous route join another company and get another candle, and so on as long as, by a change of clothes, they can escape detection of those distributing candles. Thus, instead of worshipping, they become thieves.

One thing is noticeable as we pass through the country villages. The houses are all built of mud—mud walls, mud roofs, paper windows, and a dirt floor. But no matter how poor the people may be, or what the character of their houses, the temple of the village is always made of good brick.

I have never seen a house in a country village better than the temple in the same village. I think that what I said in the beginning of this article is literally true—what the Chinese wish to do and undertake to do they are abundantly able to do. Dr. C. W. Mateer says:

"It has been estimated that each family in China spends, on an average, about \$1.50 each year in the worship of ancestors, of which at least two-thirds is for paper money. China is estimated to contain about eighty million families, which would give \$80,000,000. A fair estimate for the three annual burnings to the vagrant dead would be about \$6,000 to each hsien, or county, which would aggregate about \$10,000,000 for the whole country. The average amount burned by each family in the direct worship of the gods in the temples may be taken as about half that expended in the worship of ancestors, or \$40,000,000 for all China. Thus we have the aggregate amount of

\$130,000,000 spent annually in China for paper money for use in their worship."

While it is impossible to make a correct estimate of the amount of incense burned by the Chinese in their worship, we can nevertheless get some idea. It is the custom to burn incense three times per day, morning, noon and evening. The amount burned thus by each family in the house and at the temple amounts to about \$4,000,000 per year. The rich, of course, burn many times this amount, and some of the poor families, perhaps, not quite so much. But \$4 per year as an average is an under rather than an over estimate of the amount of incense burned by each family. This being true, the amount of incense burned by eighty million families would amount in one year to the enormous sum of \$320,000,000.





Mahomme/ Alexander Russell Webb, New York.

The Influence of Social Condition.

Paper by MOHAMMED ALEXANDER RUSSELL WEBB, of New York.




NE of the greatest mistakes the follower of any religion can make is to form and express a positive opinion of the moral effects of another religious system from the general conduct of those who profess to follow it, and, at the same time, to ignore the faults and weaknesses of those who are within the fold of his own faith. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that among the masses of believers religious prejudice is so strong as to prevent the exercise of a calm and just discrimination in the examination of an opposing creed.

It would be neither just nor truthful to assert that every man who lives in an American city, town or village, is a Christian and represents in his acts and words the natural effects of Christian teachings. Nor is it fair to judge the Islamic system in a similar manner, and yet I regret to say that it is quite generally done in Europe and in America. There are in Asia today many thousands of people who call themselves Mussulmans and yet who have a no more truthful conception of the character and teachings of Mohammed than they have of the habits of the man in the moon. If one or a dozen of these should commit an act of brutal intolerance or fanaticism, would it be just to say that it was due to the meritable tendencies of their religion?

There are several reasons why Islam and the character of its followers are so little understood in Europe and America, and one of these is that when a man adopts, or says he adopts, Islam, he becomes known as a Mussulman and his nationality becomes merged in his religion. As soon as a Hindu embraces Islam his character disappears.

If a Mohammedan, Turk, Egyptian, Syrian or African commits a crime the newspaper reports do not tell us that it was committed by a Turk, an Egyptian, a Syrian or an African, but by a Mohammedan. If an Irishman, an Italian, a Spaniard or a German commits a crime in the United States we do not say that it was committed by a Catholic,

Why Islam is
Misunderstood



a Methodist or a Baptist, nor even a Christian; we designate the man by his nationality. There are thousands of men in the prisons of our country whose religious belief, if they have any, is rarely or never referred to. We do not refer to them as Christians, simply because their parents attended a Christian church, or they themselves had a church membership at some time in the remote past. But, just as soon as a native of the East is arrested for a crime or misdemeanor, he is registered as a representative of the religion his parents followed or which he has adopted.

We should only judge of the inherent tendencies of a religious system by observing carefully and without prejudice its general effects upon the character and habits of those who are intelligent enough to understand its basic principles, and who publicly profess to teach or follow it. If we find that their lives are clean and pure and full of love and charity, we may fairly say that their religion is good. If we find them given to hypocrisy, dishonesty, uncharitableness and intolerance, we may safely infer that there is something wrong with the system they profess.

In forming our estimate of a religion we should also calmly analyze its fundamentals and consider the racial and climatic influences that surround its followers as well as their national habits and customs.

I take it that we all desire to know the truth, and that we are willing to have our attention called to the fact if we make a mistake in our estimate of our neighbor's religion. That was the sentiment that possessed me ten years ago, when I began the study of the Oriental religions, and I hope that it largely influences the minds of all who hear me today.

Another of the most potent reasons for the unfavorable opinion of Islam and its professed followers which prevails in America and Europe today, is the disposition of the people of the West to judge the people of the East by our western standard of civilization. We of the West believe that our wonderful progress in the arts and sciences, and the perfection of those means by which our physical comfort and pleasure are secured, give us just cause to feel superior to those who do not bask in the sunshine of our nineteenth century civilization. In a general way, and with some few exceptions, perhaps, we consider our social system admirable, and when we find that many Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, and other eastern people do not join with us in this opinion, we console ourselves with the belief that it is because they are heathen and incapable of recognizing and appreciating a good thing when they see it. It would, undoubtedly, surprise some of my hearers to know what many of the more intelligent Mussulmans and Hindus of India think of this civilization of ours of which we are so proud.

What Orient-
als think of our
Civilization.

There is a class of Mussulmans and Hindus and Buddhists in the East, with whom the western missionaries rarely come in contact, and when they do there is no discussion of religious doctrines, because these "heathen" have learned by experience that it is worse than a

waste of time to argue over such matters. But generally they are men of profound learning, who speak English as fluently as they do the Oriental tongues, and who are well versed in all the known systems of religion and philosophy. It will probably surprise many people here to know that nearly all the more intelligent and highly educated Mussulmans of India are quite as well informed as to the history and doctrines of the other religious systems as they are concerning their own.

We Mussulmans firmly believe that the teachings of Moses, Abraham, Jesus and Mohammed were substantially the same; that the followers of each truly inspired prophet have always corrupted and added, more or less, to the system he taught, and have drifted into materialistic forms and ceremonies; that the true spirit has often been sacrificed to what may, perhaps, be called the weak conceptions of fallible humanity.

In order to realize the influence of Islam upon social conditions, and to comprehend and appreciate the teachings of Mohammed, his whole life and apparent motives must be inspected and analyzed carefully and without prejudice. In view of the very unsatisfactory and contradictory nature of much that has been written in English concerning him, we must learn to read between the lines of so-called history. When we have done this we will find that the ethics he taught are identical with those of every other prominent religious system. That is to say, he presented the very highest standard of morality, established a system of worship calculated to produce the best results among all classes of his followers, and made aspiration to God the paramount purpose of life.

Between the
Lines of So-
called History.

Like every other truly inspired teacher, he showed that there were two aspects or divisions of the spiritual knowledge he had acquired—one for the masses who were so thoroughly occupied with the affairs of this world that they had only a very small portion of their time to devote to religion, and the other for those who were capable of comprehending the higher spiritual truths and realize that it was better to lay up treasures for the life to come than to enjoy the pleasures of this world. But his purpose, clearly, was to secure the most perfect moral results by methods applicable to all kinds and conditions of humanity.

In analyzing the sayings of the prophet, aside from the Koran, we should always bear in mind the social conditions prevalent among the Arabs at the time he taught, as well as the general character of the people. Presuming that Mohammed was truly inspired by the Supreme Spirit, it is quite reasonable to suppose that he used quite different methods of bringing the truth to the attention of the Arabs twelve hundred years ago than he would follow before an audience of intelligent, educated people, such as sits before me, in this nineteenth century.

Before proceeding further, I desire to explain that, in order to show clearly the influence of Islam upon social conditions, it will be necessary to make some comparisons between the habits and customs

in Mussulman communities and in the cities and towns of Europe and America, where Christianity is the prevailing religion. In doing this I have no intention to reflect upon the latter nor give offense to any of its followers. My purpose is to show, as lucidly and distinctly as possible, a side of the Islamic faith, which is quite familiar to my fellow countrymen and which is the life of the Moslem social fabric.

Enters a General Denial.

There are a number of objections to Islam raised by western people which I would like to reply to fully, but the very limited time allotted to me prevents my doing so. I can only enter a general denial and trust to time and the earnest, honest efforts of some of those who hear me to prove the truth of what I say. Nearly, if not quite all, the objections I refer to have their birth and growth in ignorance of the vital principles of Islam.

The chief objection and the first one generally made is polygamy. It is quite generally believed that polygamy and the *Purdah*, or exclusion of females, is a part of the Islamic system. This is not true. There is only one verse in the Koran which can possibly be distorted into an excuse for polygamy and that is, practically, a prohibition of it. Only the other day I read a communication in a church newspaper, written by a well-known clergyman who said that the Koran required the sultan of Turkey to take a new wife every year. There is no such requirement in the Koran, and what surprised me most was that such an intelligent, well educated man as the writer should make that statement. I am charitable enough to admit that he made it through ignorance. I never met but two Mussulmans in my life who had more than one wife. There is nothing in the sayings of the prophet nor in the Koran warranting or permitting the *Purdah*. During the life of the prophet and the early caliphates, the Arabian women went abroad freely, and, what is more were honored, respected and fully protected in the exercise of their rights and privileges.

Islam has been called "The religion of the sword," and there are thousands of good people in America and Europe who really believe that Mohammed went into battle with the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other. This is rather a singular charge for Christian writers to make; but they do make it and very inconsistently and unjustly, too.

The truth is that the prophet never encouraged nor consented to the propagation of Islam by force, and the Koran plainly forbids it. It says:

"Let there be no forcing in religion; the right way has been made clearly distinguishable from the wrong one. If the Lord had pleased, all who are on the earth would have believed together; and wilt Thou force men to be believers?"

And in the second Sura, 258th verse, it says:

"Let there be no compulsion in religion. Now is the right way made distinct from error; whoever, therefore, denieth Taghoot (literally error) and believeth in God, hath taken hold on a strong handle that hath no flaw. And God is He who heareth, knoweth."

Our prophet himself was as thoroughly non-aggressive and peace-loving as the typical Shaker, and, while he realized that a policy of perfect non-resistance would speedily have resulted in the murder of himself and every Mussulman in Arabia, he urged his followers to avoid, as far as possible, violent collisions with the unbelievers, and not to fight unless it was necessary in order to protect their lives. It can be shown, too, that he never in his life participated in a battle and never had a sword in his hand for the purpose of killing or maiming a human being.

It has been charged that slavery is a part of the Islamic system in the face of the fact that Mohammed discouraged it, and the Koran forbids it, making the liberation of a slave one of the most meritorious acts a person can perform. But, in weighing the evidence bearing upon this subject, we should never lose sight of the social and political conditions prevalent in Arabia at the time the prophet lived and the Koran was compiled.

It has also been said that Mohammed and the Koran denied a soul to woman and ranked her with the animals. The Koran places her on a perfect and complete equality with man, and the prophet's teachings often place her in a position superior to the males in some respects. Let me read you one passage from the Koran bearing upon the subject. It is the thirty-fifth verse of the thirty-third Sura.

Men and Woman on Equality.

"Truly the men who resign themselves to God (Moslems), and the women who resign themselves; the believing men, and the believing women; the devout men, and the devout women; the men of truth, and the women of truth; the patient men, and the patient women; the humble men, and the humble women; the men who give alms, and the women who give alms; the men who fast, and the women who fast; the chaste men, and the chaste women, the men and women who oft remember God, for them hath God prepared forgiveness and a rich recompense."

Could anything have been written to emphasize more forcibly the perfect equality of the sexes before God? The property rights which American women have enjoyed for only a few years have been enjoyed by Mohammedan women for twelve hundred years; and today there is no class of women in the world whose rights are so completely protected as those of the Mussulman communities.

And now, having endeavored to dispel some of the false ideas concerning Islam, which have been current in this country, let me show you briefly what it really is and what its natural effects are upon social conditions. Stated in the briefest manner possible, the Islamic system requires belief in the unity of God and in the inspiration of Mohammed. Its pillars of practice are physical and mental cleanliness, prayer, fasting, fraternity, alms-giving and pilgrimage. There is nothing in it that tends to immorality, social degradation, superstition or fanaticism. On the contrary, it leads on to all that is purest and noblest in the human character; and any professed Mussulman who is unclean in his person or habits, or is cruel, untruthful, dishonest,

irreverent, or fanatical, fails utterly to grasp the meaning of the religion he professes.

But there is something more in the system than the mere teaching of morality and personal purity. It is thoroughly practical, and the results, which are plainly apparent among the more intelligent Moslems, show how well the prophet understood human nature. It will not produce the kind of civilization that we Americans seem to admire so much, but it will make a man sober, honest and truthful, and will make him love his God with all his heart and all his mind, and his neighbor as himself.

Pray Five
times a Day.

Every Mussulman who has not become demoralized by contact with British civilization prays five times a day, not whenever he happens to feel like it, but at fixed periods. His prayer is not a servile, cringing petition for some material benefit, but a hymn of praise to the one incomprehensible, unknowable God, the Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnipresent Ruler of the universe. He does not believe that by argument and entreaty he can sway the judgment and change the plans of God, but with all the force of his soul he tries to soar upward in spirit to where he can gain strength, to be pure and good and holy and worthy of the happiness of the future life. His purpose is to rise above the selfish pleasures of earth and strengthen his spirit wings for a lofty flight when he is at last released from the body.

Before every prayer he is required to wash his face, nostrils, mouth, hands and feet, and he does it. During youth he acquires the habit of washing himself five times a day, and this habit clings to him through life and keeps him physically clean. He comes in touch with his religion five times a day in a manner which produces results proportionate to the intelligence and spiritual development of the man. His religion is not a thing apart from his daily life, to be put on once a week and thrown aside when it threatens to interfere with his business or pleasure. It is a fixed and inseparable part of his existence and exerts a direct and potent influence on his every thought and act. Is it to be wondered at that his idea of civilization differs from that of the West; that it is less active and progressive, less grand and imposing and dazzling and noisy?

I will confess that when I went to live among the intelligent Mussulmans I was astonished beyond measure at the social conditions I encountered. I had acquired the idea that prevails generally in this country and Europe, and was prepared to find the professed followers of Islam selfish, treacherous, untruthful, intolerant, sensual and fanatical. I was very agreeably disappointed. I saw the practical results of Islam manifested in honesty, truthfulness, sobriety, tolerance, gentleness and a degree of true brotherly love that was a surprise to me. The evils that we Americans complain of in our social system—drunkenness, prostitution, marital infidelity and cold selfishness—were almost entirely absent.

It is a significant fact that only Mussulmans who drink whisky and gamble are those who wear European clothing and imitate the

appearance and habits of the Englishmen. I have never seen a drunken Mussulman, nor one who carried the odor of whisky or beer about with him. But I have heard that some of those who have become Anglicized and have broken away from the Moslem dress and customs actually do drink beer and whisky and smoke cigarettes.

I have been in mosques where from five hundred to three thousand Mussulmans were gathered to pray, and at the conclusion of the prayer I was hemmed in by a hundred of them who were eager to shake my hand and call me their brother. But I never detected those disagreeable odors which suggest the need of extended facilities for bathing. I have repeatedly called this fact to mind while riding on the elevated railways in New York and in two or three public assemblages in London.

Prostitution and marital infidelity, with scandalous newspaper reports of divorce proceedings, are quite impossible in a Mussulman community where European influences have no foothold. A woman toiling over a washtub to support a drunken husband and several children, and a poor widow with her little ones turned into the streets for non-payment of rent are episodes that never occur where Islamic laws and customs prevail. Woman takes her place as man's honored and respected companion and helpmate and is the mistress of her home whenever she is disposed to occupy that position. Her rights are accorded to her freely.

It is true that she does not attend public balls and receptions, wearing a dress that some people might consider immodest, and waste her health and jeopardize her marital happiness in the enervating dance, nor does her husband do so. She does not go to the theater, the circus, the races, nor the public gatherings in search of amusement, but finds her pleasure and recreation at home in the pure atmosphere of her husband's and children's love and the peaceful, refining occupations of domestic life. Both she and her husband, as well as their children, are taught and believe that it is better to retire at nine, just after the prayer of the day, and arise before daybreak and say the morning prayer just as the first rays of the sun are gilding the eastern horizon.

Another feature of the Islamic social life that has impressed me is the utter absence of practical joking, or what is popularly known as "guying." There is little or no sarcasm, bitter irony, cruel wit among the Mussulmans calculated to cause their fellows chagrin, shame or annoyance, wounding the heart and breaking that bond of loving fraternity which should subsist between men. The almost universal disposition seems to be to cultivate unselfishness and patience and to place as little value as possible upon the things of this world.

In the household of the true Mussulman there is no vain show, no labored attempt to follow servilely the fashions, including furniture and ornaments, in vogue in London and Paris. Plainness and frugality are apparent everywhere, the idea being that it is far better to cultivate the spiritual side of our nature than to waste our time and money trying to keep up appearances that we hope will cause our neighbors

Pleasure and
Recreation at
Home.

to think that we have more money than we really have and are more æsthetic in our tastes than we really are.

"But," someone may say, "what about the story that a Mussulman believes that he will go directly to paradise if he dies while trying to kill a Christian?"

This is one of the numerous falsehoods invented by enemies of the truth to injure as peaceful and non-aggressive a class of people as the world has ever seen. A traveler who has visited nearly all the Mohammedan countries said to me last week: "I would rather be alone in the dark woods and miles away from a town with one hundred Mussulmans than to walk half-a-dozen blocks in the slums of an English or American city after dark."

He also told me that while he was on a steamer at Constantinople, he gave a Turkish boatman a lira, or about five dollars, to buy him some fruit and cigarettes. The English passengers laughed at his credulity and assured him that he would never see his lira again. But just as the anchor was being raised the boatman returned bringing with him the fruit and cigarettes and the exact change.

In April last a lady at the Desbrosses street ferry, in New York, gave her cloak to a young man to hold while she purchased her ticket. She has not seen it since.

Hospitable
Welcome.

A Mussulman, if he is hungry and has no lodging place, may walk into the house of a brother Mussulman and be sure of a cordial, hospitable welcome. He will be given a seat at the frugal meal and a place where he can spread his sleeping mat. One of the best of Islamic social customs is hospitality. Many Mussulmans are glad to have the opportunity to give a home and food to a poor brother, believing that God has thus favored them with the means of making themselves more worthy to inherit paradise.

The greeting, "Assalam Aleikum" (Peace be with thee), and the response, "Aleikum Salaam" (With thee be peace), have a true fraternal sound in them, calculated to arouse the love and respect of anyone who hears them. In the slums of our American cities this summer there were hundreds of hungry, homeless people, while hundreds of houses in the fashionable streets were closed and empty and their owners were living luxuriantly at summer resorts. Such a state of affairs would be impossible in a purely Mussulman community.

I have seen it asserted that, under the Islamic system, a high state of civilization is impossible. Stanley Lane-Poole writes as follows:


"For nearly eight centuries under her Mohammedan rulers, Spain set to all Europe a shining example of a civilized and enlightened state. Her fertile provinces, rendered doubly prolific by the industry and engineering skill of her conquerors, bore fruit in a hundred fold. Cities innumerable sprang up in the rich valleys of the Guadquivir and Guadiana, whose names, and names only, still commemorate the vanquished glories of their past. Art, literature and science prospered as they then prospered no where else in Europe. Students flocked from France and Germany and England to drink from the fountains of learn-

ing which flowed only in the cities of the Moors. The surgeons and doctors of Andalusia were in the van of science; women were encouraged to devote themselves to serious study, and a lady doctor was not unknown among the people of Cordova. Mathematics, astronomy and botany, philosophy and jurisprudence were to be mastered in Spain and in Spain alone. The practical work of the field, the scientific methods of irrigation, the arts of fortification and ship building, the highest and most elaborate products of the loom, the graver and the hammer, the potter's wheel and the mason's trowel were brought to perfection by Spanish lords. In the practice of war, no less than in the arts of peace, they long stood supreme. "Whatsoever makes a kingdom great and prosperous, whatsoever tends to refinement and civilization, was found in Moslem Spain."

And what has become of this grand civilization, traces of which we still see in some of the Spanish cities, and the splendid architecture of the Mogul emperors of India? It is to be seen here in Chicago and in wherever there is a manifestation of materialistic progress and enlightenment.

So long as the pure teachings of the prophet were followed the Moslem development was pure and healthy, and much more stable and admirable than the gaudy materialism that finally developed and brought with it utter ruin. True civilization—a civilization based upon purity, virtue and fraternal love—is the kind of civilization that exists today among the better classes of Mussulmans, and brings with it a degree of contentment and happiness unknown amid the tumult of the western social system. True Civilization.

The devout Mussulman, one who has arrived at an intelligent comprehension of the true teachings of the prophet, lives in his religion and makes it the paramount principle of his existence. It is with him in all his goings and comings during the day, and he is never so completely occupied with his business or worldly affairs that he cannot turn his back upon them when the stated hour of prayer arrives and present his soul to God. His loves, his sorrows, his hopes, his fears are all immersed in it; it is his last thought when he lies down to sleep at night and the first to enter his mind at dawn, when the voice of the Muezzin sings out loudly and clearly from the minaret of the mosque, waking the soft echoes of the morn with its thrilling, solemn, majestic monotones, "Come to prayer; prayer is better than sleep."



Mosque of Omar, Jerusalem.

The Koran.

By Rev. George E. Post, D. D., of Beirut, Syria.



EV. Geo. E. Post, D. D., held up a copy of the Koran, and said: "I hold in my hand a book which is never touched by two hundred millions of the human race with unwashed hands, a book which is never carried below the waist, a book which is never laid upon the floor." And Dr. Post then read without note or comment:

In chapter lxvi. is said: "O Prophet, attack the infidel with arms." And chapter ii says: "And fight for the religion of God against those who fight against you, and kill them wherever ye find them, and turn them out of that whereof they have dispossessed you." Also on page 25 it is written: "War is enjoined you against the infidels, but this is hateful unto you; yet perchance ye hate a thing which is

Religious
War Justified.

better for you, and perchance ye love a thing which is worse for you." Chapter xlviii.: "Say unto the Arabs of the desert who are left behind, ye shall be called forth against a mighty and a warlike nation, ye shall fight against them or they shall profess Islâm." And this may be translated, "until they profess Islâm." In chapter ix. it is said: "Now has God assisted you in many engagements, and particularly at the battle of Hunein, when ye pleased yourself in your multitude, but it was no manner of advantage to you and the earth was too straight for you, notwithstanding it was spacious; then did ye retreat and turn your backs. Afterward God sent down His security upon His apostle and upon the faithful, and sent down troops of angels which he saw not. Fight against them who believe not in God." And many more of a similar character.

I read in chapter iv. of the Koran: "And if ye fear that ye shall not act with equity toward orphans or the female sex, take in marriage of such other women as please you two, or three, or four, and not more." In the same chapter I read: "Ye may with your substance provide wives for yourselves." I read, however, that these were not



Polygamy
Authorized.

sufficient provisions for the Prophet, and the special revelation had to be made from heaven in these words: "O Prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives unto whom thou hast given thy dower, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee; and the daughters of thy uncles and the daughters of thy aunts, both on thy father's side and thy mother's side, who have fled with thee from Mecca, and any other believing woman, if she give herself unto the Prophet, in case the Prophet desires to take her to wife. This is a peculiar privilege granted unto thee above the rest of the true believers. We know what we have ordained them concerning their wives and their slaves which their right hands possess; lest it should be deemed a crime in thee to make use of the privilege granted thee, for God is merciful and gracious. It shall not be lawful for thee to take other women to wife hereafter, nor to exchange any of thy wives for them, although their beauty pleases thee, except the slaves whom thy right hand shall possess." The commentators, who are all of them men who stand high in the Mohammedan world, as Origen, Chrysostom, and the other fathers of the church stand in the Christian world, differ as to the meaning of these words. Some think that Mohammed was thereby forbidden to take any more wives than nine, which number he had then, and is supposed to have been his stint, as four was that of other men; some imagine that after this prohibition, though any of the wives he then had should die, or be divorced, he could not marry another in her room. Some think he was only forbidden from this time forward to marry any other woman than one of the four sorts mentioned in the passage quoted.

There is one chapter which I dare not stand before you, sisters and mothers, and wives and daughters, and read to you. I have not the face to read it; nor would I like to read it even in a congregation of men. It is the sixty-fourth chapter of the Koran. You may read that chapter if you like yourselves, and you may read the comments of their great leaders and theologians, those men on whom they rely for the interpretation of the Koran. The chapter is called "Prohibition." If I were going to name it I should call it "High License." Chapter xxiv. says: "And compel not your maid servants to prostitute their bodies." In chapter xxxiii. it is revealed to the Prophet that he is an exception to this rule: "O Prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, unto whom thou hast given their dower, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God had granted thee." Now let us hear the Koran on the subject of divorce: "Ye may divorce your wives twice, but if the husband divorce her a third time she shall not be lawful for him again until she marry another husband. But if he also divorces her, it shall be no crime in them if they return to each other." Chapter iv: "If ye be desirous of exchanging a wife for another wife and ye have already given one of them a talent, take not anything away therefrom." In chapter iv. it is said: "Ye are also forbidden to take to wife free women who are married except those women whom your right hands shall possess as slaves." But this was

not enough for the Prophet. There had to be a special revelation from God in order to justify him. The following passage was recorded on Mohammed's wives asking for more sumptuous clothes and additional allowance for their expenses. The Prophet had no sooner received the request than he gave them their option either to continue with him or be divorced. In this passage God is supposed to be the speaker. He says: "O Prophet, say unto thy wives, if ye seek this present life and the pomps thereof, come, I will make a handsome provision for you, and I will dismiss you with an honorable dismissal, but if ye seek God and His apostles, and the life to come, verily God hath prepared for such of you as work righteousness a great reward."

Mohammed purchased a slave boy named Zeid, who was a winsome youth, and Mohammed loved him. The father of the boy, hearing where he was, came to Mecca with a great ransom in his hand, and he said to Mohammed: "Give me back my boy and take this gold." Mohammed was magnanimous—he had many great and noble qualities, of which I would like to speak at another time—and Mohammed refused the ransom, and, turning to the boy, offered him his freedom. The boy, however, preferred to remain. He said to the Prophet: "I will stay with you; you are my father." After a time Mohammed had the boy swear a mighty oath at the Kaaba that he was his son, and thus he adopted him. This occurred before the proclamation of Islām. After the revelation of Islām, Mohammed gave the boy a beautiful girl named Zeinab to wife. Some years after their marriage Mohammed visited the house of Zeid in the latter's absence. His eyes fell upon this young woman and he loved her. She told her husband of this, and he, from his devotion to his adopted father, offered to divorce her so that Mohammed might marry her. Mohammed at first recoiled from this. He said it was a scandal that would ruin him, but it is alleged that God gave him a revelation on which he took the wife of his own adopted son and made her his wife. The revelation is this: "But when Zeid had determined the matter concerning her and had resolved to divorce her we joined her in marriage unto thee; lest a crime should be charged on the true believers in marrying the wives of their adopted sons' when they have determined the matter concerning them; and the command of God is to be performed. No crime is to be charged on the Prophet as to what God hath allowed him conformable to the ordinance of God with regard to those who preceded him (for the command of God is a determinate decree) who brought the messages of God and feared Him, and feared none besides God; and God is a sufficient accountant. Mohammed is not the father of any man among you, but the apostle of God and the seal of the prophets."

Mohammed a
Polygamist

The Relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the Poor and Destitute.

Paper by CHARLES F. DONNELLY, read by Rt. Rev. John J. Keane, D. D.



The Primitive Christians Charitable.

HE Christian church was from the beginning always solicitous of the poor, even in her early struggles and in the persecution she was then undergoing. This solicitude is shown in the first papal prescript transmitted by Saint Clement, the Fourth of the popes, to the Church of Corinth, wherein he said: "Let the rich give liberally to the poor, and let the poor man give praise and thanks to God for having inspired the rich man with the good will to relieve him." A little later Saint Cyprian, bishop and martyr, wrote his book on "Good Works and Alms-Deeds," an admirable treatise on Christian charity, for which he was distinguished.

Under the auspices of the church the primitive Christians established means for the relief of the poor, the sick and the travelers in distress or needing shelter, hospitals for lepers, societies for the redemption of captive slaves, congregations of females for the relief of indigent women, associations of religious women for redeeming those of their sex who were leading dissolute lives, and hospitals for the sick, the orphaned, the aged and afflicted of all kinds, like the Hotel-Dieu, founded in Paris in the seventeenth century and still perpetuated.

The story of the origin of resorting to the place for the cure of the insane is that an Irish princess, Saint Dymphna, was slain there May 15, A. D. 600, by the hand of her own father, a pagan, who having become enraged at her conversion to Christianity, caused her to flee, and pursuing her there, beheaded her. An insane person witnessing the act was cured, and thus a belief became current that miraculous cures of the insane were effected by visiting the spot where she was beheaded. A shrine was erected there and in A. D. 1340 a memorial church was added.

It is fair to assume that the charitable religious of the neighborhood saw early that the ancient methods of imprisoning the insane were irrational, and so gradually surrounded them with conditions akin to their home lives, and gently led them to improve, if not to wholly recover their reason, under a method of treatment centuries in advance of the most intelligent methods pursued with the insane until our time, when we find no better system can be followed.

The church was, it may be said, almost unreservedly, the only almoner to the poor in primitive times, up to the period when modern history begins; for charity was not a pagan virtue, and man had not been taught it until the Redeemer's coming; so the religious houses, the monasteries, convents, asylums and hospitals were the great houses of refuge and charity the poor and needy had to resort to in their distress in later times.

The Church
an Almoner.

But there appeared in the seventeenth century a man surpassing all who preceded him in directing the attention of mankind to the wants and necessities of the poor and to the work of relieving them, the great and good St. Vincent de Paul, whose name and memory will ever be revered while the church of Christ endures. Born on April 24, 1576, in the little village of Pouy, near Dax, south of Bordeaux, bordering on the Pyrennees; he was ordained priest in 1600, and later fell into the hands of the Turks and was sold as a slave at Tunis.

St. Vincent de
Paul.

In the great work of St. Vincent de Paul nothing commends itself more to this practical age than his plan of enlisting large bodies of laymen to coöperate with the clergy by establishing confraternities in each parish of men who devote themselves to seeking out, visiting and relieving the sick, the orphaned and the destitute. Such associations achieve in a quiet and unostentatious way wonderful results by the modest contributions of their own members chiefly and by the zeal and effectiveness of the work they do. France leads in such organizations naturally enough, but the United States is emulating her successfully and will, in view of what has been accomplished here of late years, soon surpass that nation.

The work of founding ecclesiastical charitable organizations did not cease with the labors of St. Vincent de Paul, nor has it ceased at the present day. It will be well to recall at this point a few of the many active rather than the contemplative orders and congregations that we may be reminded of the constant care exercised by the church over those in need, and here it should also be mentioned that while such deserving praise is given St. Vincent de Paul for laying the foundations for the most active religious communities ever established under the auspices of the church, there were others who preceded him early in the same direction, but without achieving the same success, and conspicuously the Alexian, or Cellite Brothers, founded in 1325, at Aix-la-Chapelle, devoted to nursing the sick, especially in times of pestilence, the care of lunatics and persons suffering from epilepsy.

de Paul's
Work.

In 1572 the congregation of the Brothers-Hospitallers of St. John of God was also founded for the care of the sick, infirm and poor.

Twenty years after St. Vincent de Paul ended his life of charity there was founded at Rheims, in 1680, the congregation of the Brothers of the Christian Schools for the instruction of poor children. In 1804 the Christian Brothers were founded in Ireland, mainly for the education of poor youths; at Ghent, the congregation of Brothers of Charity, in 1809, who devote their lives to aged, sick, insane and incurable men, and to orphans, abandoned children and the deaf, dumb and blind; at Paris, in 1824, the Sisterhood of Bon Secours was established for the care of the sick; in 1828, the Fathers of the Institute of Charity; in Ireland, in 1831, the Community of the Sisters of Mercy was founded for visiting the sick, educating the poor and protecting destitute children, and this religious body of women has now several hundred houses established in different parts of the world. For the reclamation and instruction of women and girls who had fallen from virtue the Nuns of the Good Shepherd were established in 1835. At St. Servan, in Brittany, some peasant women, chiefly young working women and domestic servants, instituted the Little Sisters of the Poor, in 1840, having for their object the care of the aged poor, irrespective of sex or creed, and they, too, have hundreds of houses now in nearly all the large cities of the world.

The Church
More Charitable than the
State.

But is the state the best almoner? In ancient times in England it was considered wiser to leave the whole duty of providing for the poor to those who would be required by humanity and religion to care for them, namely, the clergy, regular and secular; and the duty devolved on them, for centuries, as we have seen. Out of the tithes, the products of the labor of the monasteries, and the charitable contributions given by the laity to dispense, came the sole means of maintaining the poor in Catholic England, there being no compulsory methods by common law, or statute, looking to their support, and Blackstone himself credits the monasteries with the principal support of the poor in Catholic times.

The affecting death of Father Damian among the lepers of Molokai was better than all polemical discourses to allay religious rancor where it may exist, and to awaken in the mind of all reflecting Christians the importance not only of extending charity to the heathen in remote places, but to each other at home in our differences relating to creed and opinion.

It is not improbable that within a few years great changes will be made by the Catholic church itself in the administration of many of its charities throughout the world. Some of its organizations are greatly impressed with the importance of studying new systems and methods of relief growing out of the social conditions of the nineteenth century. The slender equipment of the poor child in the past for the part he had to play in life; the continuous, or casual, administration of alms to the destitute, instead of leading them kindly and firmly forward from de-

pendence on others to self-help and self-reliance, are not adapted to the needs of the present, or to anticipate the requirements of the future.

Ubi Petrus Ibi Ecclesia: "Where Peter is, there is the church," and Rome was made by the poor fishermen of Galilee the seat of the church nearly nineteen hundred years ago, and the seat of the church it remains, and shall to the end of time. In considering our subject it would seem the work would be incomplete if we did not inquire what the relations of the church to the poor and destitute have been, at its seat and center. Far back in the history of Christian Rome all the nations of Europe assisted in contributing to the opening of asylums for strangers there in distress. Prior to the advent of secular rule there, under the existing government, the income for her charities was \$800,000 per annum, with the population less than 175,000.

The Home-
less Poor Cared
For.

It is impossible in a summary of this nature to give more than an outline of the ecclesiastical charities of Rome, as they existed up to the assumption of the government by the reigning family, in Italy; but in the recital of those charities it is well to mention the schools of gratuitous instruction, which were founded by Clement XIII., in 1592; by the Peres Doctrinaires, in 1727, and by St. Angela de Meresia, in 1655, the latter mainly for poor females, and all instructing in the ordinary branches of a common school education. Then there were fifty-five regionary schools; a number of parochial schools, and besides 374 general, or public free schools for the young, with 484 teachers and fourteen thousand pupils, in attendance. So it appears the church has not failed in her duty to the poor at her center.

Rome's Char-
ities.

In the United States there are over seven hundred Catholic charitable institutions, the inmates of which are maintained almost entirely by the contributions of their co-religionists, who, with their fellow citizens of other denominations, share in the burden of general taxation, proportionately to their means, in maintaining the poor at the public charitable institutions besides. A truly anomalous condition, but arising from the strong adherence of Catholics to the idea that charity is best administered, where not attended to individually, by those in the religious life, who give to the poor of their means, not through public officers and bureaus, but through those who serve the poor in the old apostolic spirit, with love of God and their less fortunate neighbor and brother actuating them. In the scheme of the dispensation of public charity relief is extended on the narrow ground that there is some implied obligation on the part of the state to maintain the citizen in his necessities in return for service rendered or expected; but the church imposes the burden on the conscience of every man of helping his neighbor in distress, apart from any service done or expected, and teaches that all in suffering are entitled to aid, whether they live within or without the territory; neither territory, nor race, nor creed can limit Christian charity. In its relation to the poor the church will always be in the future, as she has been in the past, in advance of the state in all examples of beneficence.

The Catholic
idea of Charity.



Sunka-Gi and Family, Indian Police.

The Religion of the North American Indians.

Paper by MISS ALICE C. FLETCHER.



THE North American continent, extending from the tropics to the Polar seas, presents wide diversity of physical aspects, and many distinctive environments which have left their impress upon the arts and cults of its peoples. Within this extended area there are two races, the Esquimau, which will not come under our consideration today, and the American race proper.

This race, like our own, is composed of many peoples speaking different languages, languages belonging to widely different stocks. In our race these stocks are few in number, but here, in North America, there are more than two score, each varying from all the others as widely as the Semitic from the Aryan.

Among so many linguistic stocks one would expect to find tribes of various mental capacities, and we do find them. There are some possessing a richer imagination, greater vitality of ideas and greater power of organization, and these people have impressed themselves upon others less capable of organization and power of growth. Thus it has happened here, as elsewhere, that one people has been permeated by the ideas of another while preserving its own language intact, as with us, who speak an Aryan tongue, but have become imbued with the religious thought of the Semites.

The people we are considering are very ancient people. There is no reason to doubt that their ancestors were the men whose implements and weapons have been found associated with the remains of extinct specimens of animals. This evidence of antiquity is re-inforced by the recent discovery of an eminent Mexican archæologist, who has found the key to the interpretation of the ancient Mexican calendar, thereby revealing a system of time measurements based upon

Tribes of Various mental Capacities.



the recurrence of a certain relative position of the sun and moon, which required for the completion of its grand cycle one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four years. By the lowest calculation this calendar was in use two thousand three hundred years B. C.

Thus four thousand years ago the Mexicans were using a highly artificial calendar, one that, so far as is known today, could not have been borrowed from any other people, since nothing like it has been discovered in any other part of the world. How many years must have been spent in the observations which led to its construction who can say? But we know that from the completion of this system the Mexican people had fixed religious rites, and that their elaborate worship was regulated by cycles within the great cycle of their wonderful calendar.

Startling as is the fact that in this so-called New World we are able to study a culture more than four thousand years old, stranger facts may come to light in the near future. The point to be emphasized is, that here in North America exists a race of great antiquity that has conserved social and religious forms which, speaking broadly, antedate those of the historic periods of the East. Here we can study not only the slow growth of society, but the equally slow and unequal development of man's mental and spiritual nature.

A Race of
Great Antiquity

A comprehensive sketch of the religion of the North American Indian cannot be given within the limits of this paper, much less a definite picture. Only the indication of a few salient points is possible, and even these will not be easy to make clear because of our own complex methods of thought. Anything approaching a consensus of Indian beliefs can be obtained only from a careful study of the myths of the people, of their ceremonies, their superstitions and their various customs, and by searching through all these for the underlying principle, the governing thoughts and motives. Nowhere among the tribes can be found any formulated statement of belief; in no ceremony or ritual does there appear anything resembling a creed. This paper is therefore predicated upon points of general unity. The vagueness of the Indian's metaphysics must never be lost sight of, and to eliminate any scheme comprehensible to us from his mass of poetical and often seemingly inconsequential thought, is an exceedingly delicate and difficult task. One runs the risk of formulating something, which although true in the premises, might be unrecognizable by the Indian himself.

The aboriginal American's feeling concerning God seems to indicate a power, mysterious, unknowable, unnamable, that animates all nature. From this power, in some unexplained way, proceeded in the past ages certain generic types, prototypes of everything in the world, and these still exist, but they are invisible to man in his natural state, being spirit types, although he can behold them and hear them speak in his supernatural visions. Through these generic types, as through so many conduits, flows the life coming from the great mysterious source of all life into the concrete forms which make up this world, as the sun, moon and the wind, the water, the earth and the thunder, the birds, the animals and the fruits of the earth.

Among these prototypes there seems to have been none of man himself, but in some vaguely imagined way he has been generated by them, and his physical as well as his spiritual nature is nourished and augmented through them. His physical dependence upon these sources of power is illustrated in his ceremonies. Thus, when the tribe was about to set out upon the hunt as in the buffalo country, the leaders, who represented the people, gathered together in a solemn ceremony. They sat crouched about a central fire, each wrapped in the skin of a buffalo, their attitude and their manner of partaking the food for the occasion were in imitation of this animal. They became as buffalo putting themselves in the line of transmission, so to speak, appealing to the generic or typical buffalo that the life flowing from this particular projection of the creative power into the specific buffalo might be transmitted to them, that when they killed and ate of the creature they might be imbued with its strength.

This is all very simple to the Indian; nothing is mysterious where all is mystery. Ignorant of the processes of nature, everything is simply alive to him and all life is the same life, continually passing over from one form to another. He takes the life of the corn when he eats it and its life passes into and reinforces his own equally with the life of the animal which goes out under his hand. So he hunted, fished and planted, having first appealed to the prototype for physical strength through a ceremony which always included the partaking of food.

But the Indian recognized other needs than those of the body, his spirit demanded strengthening and, to satisfy its needs, he reversed his manner of appeal. Instead of gathering together with his fellows, he went apart and remained in solitude upon the mountain or in the recesses of the forest; instead of eating in companionship, he fasted and mortified his body, sought to ignore it, denied its cravings, that some spirit prototype might approach him and reinforce his spirit with life drawn from the great unnamable power. Whatever was the prototype which appeared to him, whether of bird or beast, or of one of the elements, it breathed upon him and left a song with him which should become the viewless messenger speeding from the heart and lips of the man, to the prototype of his vision, to bring him help in the hour of his need.

Strength for
the Spirit.

When the man had received his vision, before it could avail him, he had to procure something from the creature whose type he had seen, a tuft of hair, or a feather, or he had to fashion its semblance or emblem. This he carried ever after near him as a token of remembrance, but he did not worship it. His aspiration does not appear to have rested upon the prototype, although his imagination seems to have carried him no farther, but in some vague way each man had thus his mode of individual approach to the unnamable source of life.

The belief that everything was alive and active to help or hinder man not only led to numberless observances in order to placate and win favor, but it also prevented the development of individual respon-

sibility. Success or failure was not caused solely by a man's own actions or shortcomings, but because he was helped or hindered by some one of these occult powers. Self torture was an appeal to the more potent of these forces and was a propitiation, rather than a sacrifice, arising from a consciousness of evil in himself, for the Indian seldom thought of himself as being in the wrong, his peculiar belief concerning his position in nature having engendered in him a species of self righteousness. Time forbids any illustration of this intricate belief, the numerous ramifications of which underlie every public and private act of the race.

Personal Im
mortality.

Personal immortality was universally recognized. The next world resembled this with the element of suffering eliminated. There was no place of future punishment; all alike started at death upon the journey to the other world, but the quarrelsome and unjust never reached it, they endlessly wandered.

Religious ceremonials had both open and esoteric forms and teachings. They were comprised in the observances of secret societies and the elaborate dramatization of myths, with its masks, costumes, rituals of song, rhythmic movements of the body and the preparation and use of symbols.

As the ceremonials of the Indians from Alaska to Mexico rise before me, it is difficult to dismiss them without a word, for they are impressive and instructive, and although their grotesque features, and in some instances their horrible realism overlies and seems to crush out the purpose of the portrayal, yet they all contain evidences of the mind struggling to find an answer to the ever pressing question of man's origin and destiny.

The ethics of the race were simple.

With the Indian, truth was literal rather than comprehensive. This conception led to great punctiliousness in the observance of all forms and ceremonies, although it did not prevent the use of artifice in war or in the struggle for power, but nothing excused a man who broke his word.

Justice was also literal and inexorable. Retributive justice was in exact proportion to the offense. There was no extenuation, there was no free forgiveness. A penalty must be enacted for every misdeed. Justice, therefore, often failed of its end not having in it the element of mercy.

To be valorous, to meet hardships and suffering uncomplainingly, to flinch from no pain or danger when action was demanded, was the ideal set before every Indian. A Ponca Indian who paused an instant in battle to dip up a handful of water to slake his burning thirst brought upon himself such ignominy that he sought death to hide his shame.

Hospitality was a marked virtue in the race. The lodge was never closed, or the last morsel of food ever refused to the needy. The richest man was not he who possessed the most, but he who had given away the most. This deeply rooted principle of giving is a great obsta-

cle in the way of civilizing the Indians, as civilization depends so largely upon the accumulation of property.

In every home the importance of peace was taught and the quarrelsome person pointed out as one not to be trusted, since success would never attend his undertakings, whom neither the visible nor invisible powers would befriend.

This virtue of peace was inculcated in more than one religious ritual, and it was the special theme and sole object of a peculiar ceremony which once widely obtained over the valley of the Mississippi—the Calumet or Sacred Pipe ceremony. The symbols used point back to myths which form the groundwork of other ceremonies hoary with age. In the presence of these symbolic pipes there could be no strife. Marquette, in 1672, wrote: "The calumet is the most mysterious thing in the world. The scepters of our kings are not so much respected, for the Indians have such a reverence for it that we may call it the God of Peace and War, and the arbiter of life and death. * * * One with this calumet may venture among his enemies, and in the hottest battles they lay down their arms before this Sacred Pipe."

Virtue of
Peace.

The ceremony of these pipes could only take place between men of different gentes or of different tribes. Through it they were made as one family, the affection, the harmony, and the good will of the family being extended far beyond the ties of blood. Under this benign influence of the pipes strangers were made brothers and enemies became friends. In the beautiful symbolism and ritual of these fellowship pipes the initiated were told in the presence of a little child, who typified teachableness, that happiness came to him who lived in peace and walked in the straight path, which was symbolized on the pipes as glowing with sunlight. In these teachings, which transcended all others, we discern the dawn of the nobler and gentler virtues of mercy and its kindred graces.

We are recognizing today that God's family is a large one and that human sympathy is strong. Upon this platform have been gathered men from every race of the eastern world, but the race that for centuries was the sole possessor of this western continent has not been represented. No American Indian has told us how his people have sought after God through the dim ages of the past. He is not here, but cannot his sacred symbol serve its ancient office once more and bring him and us together in the bonds of peace and brotherhood?



Dionysios Latas, Archbishop of Zante, Greece.

The Orthodox Greek Church.

Paper by THE MOST REV. DIONYSIOS LATAS, Archbishop of Zante,
Greece.



EVEREND ministers of the eminent name of God, the creator of the world and of man: Ancient Greece prepared the way for Christianity and rendered smooth the path for the diffusion and propagation of it in the world. Greece undertook to develop Christianity and formed and systemized a Christian church; that is the church of the east, the original Christian church, which for this reason historically and justly may be called the mother of the Christian churches. [Applause.] The original establishment of the Greek church is directly referred to the presence of Jesus Christ and His apostles.

The coming of the Messiah, from which the God was to originate in this world, was at a fixed point of time, as the Apostle Paul said it was to be. The fullness of this point of time ancient Greece was predestined to point out and determine. Greece had so developed letters, arts, sciences, philosophy and every other form of progress that in comparison with it all other nations were exhausted. For this reason the inhabitants of that happy land used rightly and properly to say: "Whoever is not a Greek is a barbarian." But while at that time, under Plato and Aristotle, Greek philosophy had arrived at the highest phase of its development, Greece at that very period, after these great philosophers, began to decline and fall. The Macedonian and Roman armies gave a definite blow to the political independence and national liberty of Greece, but at the same time opened up to Greece a new career of spiritual life and brought it into immediate contact and intercommunication with other nations and peoples of the earth.

Tracing the effect of Grecian philosophy of the Neo-Platonic school upon the faith which came from the east, the archbishop continued:

When the Roman empire began to fall Christianity had to under-

Christianity
as a Fraternal
Agency.

take the great struggle of acquiring a superiority over all other religions that it might demolish the partition walls which separated race from race, nation from nation. [Great applause.] It is the work of Christianity to bring all men into one spiritual family, into the love of one another, and into the belief of one supreme God. [Applause.] Mary, the most blessed of all human kind, appears and brings forth the expected divine nature revealed to Plato. She brings forth the fulfillment of the ideals of the Gods of the different peoples and nations of the ancient world. She brings forth at last that one whose name, whose shadow came down into the world and overshadowed the souls, the minds, the hearts of all men, and removed the mystery from every philosophy and philosophic system.

Two
sard. Voices

In this permanent idea and the tendencies of the different peoples in such a time and religion, I may say two voices are heard. One, though it is from Palestine, re-echoed into Egypt, and especially to Alexandria and through parts of Greece and Rome. Another voice from Egypt re-echoed through Palestine, and through it over all the other countries and peoples of the east. And the voices from Palestine, having Jerusalem as their focus and center, re-echoed the voice back again to the Grecians and the Romans. And there it was that His doctrine fell amidst the Greek nations, the Grecian element of character, Greek letters and the sound reasoning of different systems of Greek philosophy. [Great applause.]

Surely in the regeneration of the different peoples there had been a divine revelation in the formation of all human kind into one spiritual family through the goodness of God, in one family equal, without any distinctions between the mean and the great, without distinction of climate or race, without distinction of national destiny or inspiration, of name or nobility, of family ties. And all the beauties which ever clustered around the ladder of Jacob, or were given to it by the men of Judea, was given by the prophets to the Virgin Mary in the cave of Bethlehem. But Greece gave Christianity the letters, gave the art, gave, as I may say, the enlightenment with which the Gospel of Christianity was invested, and presented itself then, and now presents itself before all nations.

After referring to his scholarly historical disquisition the archbishop continued:

First Chris-
ian Church.

It suffices me to say that no one of you, I believe, in the presence of these historical documents will deny that the original Christian, the first Christian church was the church of the east, and that is the Greek church. Surely the first Christian churches in Asia Minor, Egypt and Assyria were instituted by the apostles of Christ and for the most part in Greek communities. All those are the foundation stones on which the present Greek church is based. [Great applause.] The apostles themselves preached and wrote in the Greek letters and all the teachers and writers of the Gospel in the east, the contemporaries and the successors of the apostles were teaching, preaching and writing in the Greek language. Especially the two great schools, that

of Alexandria and that of Antioch, undertook the development of Christianity and form and systematize a Christian church. The great teachers and writers of these two schools, whose names are very well known, labored courageously to defend and determine forever the Christian doctrine and to constitute under divine rules and forms a Christian church.

At last, the Greek Christian, therefore, may be called historically and justly the treasurer of the first Christian doctrine, fundamental evangelical truths. It may be called the art which bears the spiritual manna and feeds all those who look to it in order to obtain from it the richness of the ideas and the unmistakable reasoning of every Christian doctrine, of every evangelical truth, of every ecclesiastical sentiment.

After this, my oration about the Greek church, I have nothing more to add than to extend my open arms and embrace all those who attend this congress of the ministers of the world. I embrace, as my brothers in Jesus Christ, as my brothers in the divinely inspired Gospel, as my friends in eminent ideas and sentiments, all men; for we have a common Creator, and consequently a common Father and God. And I pray you lift with me for a moment the mind toward the divine essence, and say with me, with all your minds and hearts, a prayer to Almighty God.

A Common
Creator.

Most High, omnipotent King, look down upon human kind; enlighten us that we may know Thy will, Thy ways, Thy holy truths. Bless and magnify the reunited peoples of the world and the great people of the United States of America, whose greatness and kindness has invited us from the remotest parts of the earth in this their Columbian year to see with them an evidence of their progress in the wonderful achievements of the human mind and the human soul.

Archbishop's
Prayer.



Idol of Thetis in Ghiza.

Woman and the Pulpit.

Paper by REV. ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL.




FEELINGS which come unbidden from the influence of our surroundings tend to produce in us the willing acceptance of anything to which we are accustomed. We live so much more vividly in the present than in the past or future that anything here and now seems to have more claim upon us than higher ideals which wait to be realized. Chilly rain falling steadily for a day or two makes it difficult to shake off the feeling that the same weather will continue without limit. Experience tells us that warmth and sunshine will be here directly, but it is not easy to recall the sensation produced by cheerful bright days. If this is true of events to which we are accustomed, how much more then of the less familiar, larger facts of history. The present becomes the instructive measure of the future.

This tendency is much more influential than may be supposed in the settlement of many of the great problems of life, and it forms the only justification for the opposition still felt by very excellent persons to the presence and the wise helpful teaching of capable women in the Christian pulpit. Serious arguments against feminine preaching were answered long ago. It is no longer believed that women are pre-eminently deficient in mind or character. Many of the older matrons and unmarried women and some even of the young mothers have already demonstrated their capacity for doing large amounts of benevolent outside work without detriment either to the home, to society, or to their own highest womanly natures. Wherever any of the fairly acceptable women preachers are heard and known long enough to make their speaking and their good work familiar and appreciated, there it is already accepted that the sex of the worker is not a bar to good work. The easy adaptability to new duties is admitted without question. It makes its own place successfully in the varied social domain just as every tree is said to do, let it be planted almost anywhere, adding its own new charm to the landscape.

Some one tells a pleasant story of the little boy and girl of a

Women Efficient in Mind and Character.



clergywoman who, like many other children, were discussing together what they were going to do when they grew up.

"I'm going to be a minister like mamma," said the little girl. "What'll you be?"

The boy reflected a while dubiously, but the calling nearest at hand won the day. "I'm doin' to be a minister, too," he said.

Then the sister put on her small thinking cap, but after a few minutes she replied, seriously, "Well, I suppose mans do preach some-times."

But the world is so miscellaneously broad that some of the best men never heard a woman preacher. They never tried to apply the higher criticism to some of St. Paul's much quoted sayings about women. They verily believe that to hinder "female preaching and ordination" to the utmost stretch of their ability is doing God's service. They tighten, reclang and rivet afresh with more glittering steel, loosening ecclesiastical bonds which belonged to less enlightened ages; for they sincerely think that the world-wide woman movement is only a perverse, detestable offshoot of pernicious infidel tendencies.

A greater intellectual blunder than this timid, illogical assumption has seldom been made. Religious creeds have been shaken to their foundations. But women far more than men stood firmly on the foundation. It is they who were serenely confident that true religion, if tried in mental and moral furnaces heated seven times, will yet come out purified, refined, triumphant. It is they who latterly gave both service and money so lavishly for home and foreign benevolences that the church is both astonished and bewildered, though it opens the mouths of its sacks to receive the supplies and it establishes unusual church offices, as that of deaconess, and evangelist, to afford safe outlets for quickened womanly zeal.

Every Field
of Work.

Women are taking an active, increasing share in the education, the thought and the investigations of the age and are passing into almost every field of work certainly to no obvious disadvantage to any worthy interest. This great parliament of religions is, in evidence, that narrow conservatism is rapidly decreasing and that our conception of the religious pulpit must widen until it can take in all faiths, all tongues which strive to enforce the living spirit of love of God and man. But, on the principle that one outside sheep astray in pastures already cropped to exhaustion is more to be sought after than ninety-nine in the fold, this paper, designed to be both a brief history and discussion of facts, will indirectly remember the unconvinced multitude. As the remoter distances on the painter's canvas are important aids to the bringing out of his principal figures, so the past is an essential background for the present.

Recently historians from critical comparative study have decided that in the progress of all peoples toward enlightenment there was a time when women represented the hardship of the family and the tribe or clan more exclusively than men have represented such hardships under later civilizations. That this so-called Matriarchate was a higher

state of civilization than the present, no one can well believe; yet that it had less tendency in any way, good or bad, to limit the freedom of women is incontrovertible. Progress has never moved along all lines simultaneously; an advance is sometimes so blunderingly achieved that a step forward necessitates a dozen steps backward to interests that have been so needlessly interwoven that they are all pushed violently into the rear.

If Christianity had fully decided the modern status of society, there would have been neither male nor female in church, or state, or education, or property, or influence, or work, or honor. Choice and capacity would have established all questions of usefulness. Is God, who is no respecter of persons, a respecter of sex? Paul's exposition of practical Christianity is: "In honor preferring one another." As the heavens are high above the earth, so is that principle above those who have largely controlled the relations of men and women. Compare the bright Ithuriel pointing his sword, "having touch of celestial temper," with the other one: "squat like a toad close at the ear of Eve" and not very far from Adam.

Is God a Res-
pecter of Sex?

Under barbarism, when no child could inherit except from the mother, personal property and power were as yet but partially separate from the community interests. The tribe or clan was a social unit for offense, defense and ownership. Their gods were tutelary, household and tribal gods. Like other property safest around the hearthstones, they or their symbols were given into the safe keeping of women. Religion and government were not separate. The mothers controlled the children, took part in the sagest councils of religion, policy or war, or became interpreters, seers or priests as spontaneously as women today, having more leisure time than men, are most active in affairs of society for their class and in benevolences for the less favored. In that condition of morals women could only safely bequeath wealth as chieftainship to sons of their own lineage. That social order was an accepted fact and, miserable as it was, it kept its women and its men side by side, equals in the onward march toward a better future.

When property and power were gained by some of the stronger males, naturally they desired to bequeath these to their own children. From that time female chastity began to be enforced as the leading virtue for the legal wives and daughters. In classic lands we know that it was the wives only who were held to this most imperative of all helps to high social order and equity. Courtesans, male and female, were still respectable. Priestesses still held the high, often the highest rank, still interpreted the oracles, lived in the temples, and their social vices were not only sanctioned but enjoined by their religion. The legal adoption of heirs to share with or supersede children born in wedlock was an accepted custom. Unnatural vices also were made honorable.

The ruder frank savagery of the Matriarchate was considerate of women, because it had not found any way how even to attempt to be

successful otherwise. The infamous schemes which have baffled every subsequent civilization, which have destroyed many and which must destroy all if not repudiated, the futile schemes for securing virtuous wives and legitimate children without entirely discontinuing a wide license for husbands, fathers and sons, had not arisen for these simpler heathen folk.

Plain Speaking.

Too much is at stake here to allow anything but plain speaking. God forbid that I should charge all good men and women with willingly upholding this basest of all injustice. We inherit our early environments. Custom blinds us to the ethics which we accept while life is rosy; but the men and women of this parliament can afford to look all facts in the face. The later enforced civil inferiority of women, their legal pauperism from the day when they become wives, the church's solemn requirement of wifely obedience, the husband's custody of the wife, the entire education for debilitating seclusive timidity and dependence, all sprang from the same baneful root. It has demoralized even our idea of a strong, beautiful womanhood. And woman's long exclusion from the pulpit, from the most consecrated place which Christianity has kept for its supposed best and noblest, is the outgrowth of the same basal iniquity.

Is this a hard saying? No living historian who takes as his searchlight modern methods of studying sacred, secular, domestic and civil society in mutual dependence can question this conclusion. No other explanation is adequate to the various facts. The East adopted close veiling and almost literal imprisonment of high class and favorite women. Why, if not to enforce wifely chastity? Even the small feet of the best classes of Chinese women have an equally probable origin. Helplessness was security. The lower class could be left in greater freedom. But mental fetters are more potent than physical bonds. Two antipodal religions, Mohammedanism and the Latter Day Saints, bound the consciences, befogged the intellects and crucified the souls of women to give religious sanction to polygamy for men. One high moral standard was not adopted. There were but two alternatives—either plural wives whose supposed welfare in time and eternity was hung upon the skirts of exalted husbands, or Christendom's half-disguised, cruel separation of feminine humanity into two divisions, the sheltered monogamous wives and those unwedded others. Of the two plans, which is the most unchristian, let the casuists decide.

Woman's Aptitude for Religious Devotion.

The highest code of morals is not elastic, but both men and women must look aloft before they can cordially appreciate its teachings. To be hedged about by conventions is not to learn a self-reliant rectitude. Was there ever a reason why capable, good women should not have continued to be expounders of the highest truth to which their era could attain? They have always manifested a special aptitude for religious devotion. About twice as many women as men are members of churches in all sects, whose ministers are received by vote, and they are more persistent in their attendance on religious services everywhere. This has always been largely true. Has

it ever been wise to fetter conscience or to nourish a weak self-consciousness in the illumined presence of a great hope which points on to an endless triumphant future?

Must female modesty be taught to shrink from the public eye as ashamed of the womanhood God has bequeathed it in His wisdom? Dare one allow a poor, shrinking timidity to be pitted against sweet, retiring solemn consolations and inspirations which comfort and strengthen needy humanity? Can we think of Jesus as possibly hindered by modesty from proclaiming to sin-laden multitudes, "Blessed are the pure in heart, blessed are the peacemakers?" Can we say the one who counted not His own life here in the service of others, indorsed a self-consciousness so monstrous as to absorb and stifle the Divine proclamation of good will to men? His twelve disciples were not women; but He went about doing good and had not where to lay His head. Women could hardly share His full pilgrimages. But who were His personal friends? Did He not say, "Mary has chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her?" It was not Jesus who established the apostolic succession.

If only superficial feminine propriety build up the walls between women and the most consecrated work, such walls will tumble down without even the blowing of a horn. The real proprieties will be preserved. There is no impropriety in proclaiming truth from the highest house-top. The most consecrated pulpit is less sacred than the living principle. If reverent lips proclaim holiness and truth, the gaze of the thousands who listen can brush no down from the cheek of maidenhood or wifehood. Our ancestors took their lives in their hands when they came to colonize this country. Their daughters took the approval of their own consciences and the betterment of the lives of others into their hearts when they stepped unheralded upon the open platform and into the Christian pulpit. Their perils were not largely physical, but there was a good deal of sore stepping upon the pricks of public opinion and some walking among the heated plowshares of intemperate disapproval. All that has melted away like black clouds in the morning sunrise, and the cheerful colors alone remain. The fitness of the primary educators of the race to be moral and religious teachers has easily demonstrated itself. It was as inevitable.

The Real Proprieties will be Preserved.

In 1853 an orthodox Congregational church called a council and ordained three women pastors, who had been already settled among them for six or eight months. Then followed a long waiting of ten years. In 1863 two women were ordained by the Universalist church, Rev. Olympia Brown, one of the speakers on this platform, and Dr. Augusta J. Chapin, the first woman to be honored in this year of grace as D. D., who is also chairman of the woman's branch of this parliament. In that second decade, so far as yet ascertained, three other women received ordination, only five in all. In the third decade thirty or forty were ordained, and in the fourth decade about two hundred have received ordination from many denominations—Congre-

gationalists, Universalists, Christian, Unitarian, Protestant, Methodists, Free Baptists and many other sects.

Numbers of our most earnest religious speakers have not chosen to seek ordination. Most of these women are, or have been, stated preachers or pastors of churches, and are believed to have proved themselves to be successful above the average in promoting the religious welfare of the church and community. This memorable and commemorative season's succession of congresses in this place, dedicated first to progress then to art, is an excellent gauge of today's opinion. Even this temple has not felt itself to be profaned by the platform presence of women, and it is believed that the hundred of feminine voices which have been heard will leave no discordant echo behind. This annealing world's parliament of religions welcomes half a score of women to share in the presentation of comparative religions.

Influence of
the Sex as
Teachers.

The sympathetic recognition of the magnetic influence of the sex as teachers is recognized, the need of representation for the protection of material interests is conceded, but who anticipates that the entrance of another type of humanity actively into the world's thought, with its modified insights and inspiration must widen the spiritual horizon. Women are needed in the pulpit as imperatively and for the same reason that they are needed in the world, because they are women. Women have become—or when the ingrained habit of unconscious imitation has been superseded, they will become—indispensable to the religious evolution of the human race. Every religion for the people must be religion sought after and interpreted by the people. So only can it become adequate mentally and spiritually to the universal needs and to the intelligent acceptance of a whole humanity. Every teacher, having taken into his own heart a central principle, around which clusters a kindred group of ideas, all baptized in the light of his believing soul, brings to us vividly the fullness of his personal convictions. His words are in light with his thought, are warm with his feeling, are alive with his life. To me, the pulpit of the future will be a consecrated platform upon which may stand every such soul and freely proclaim those best and highest convictions which must convince, strengthen, comfort and elevate his own mental and spiritual being.



The Door of the Temple of Denderah.

The Divine Basis of the Co-operation of Men and Women.

Paper by MRS. LYDIA H. DICKINSON.



Woman a
Factor in the
World's Pro-
gress.

WHAT is the divine basis of the co-operation of men and women? In attempting briefly to answer this question we must consider first the nature of the original bond between man and woman. And here secular history gives us no help. We find them separated when history begins. The woman is subject to the man, and custom, law and the parties themselves are acquiescent in the subjection—woman quite equally with man. Yet, on the other hand, history bears ample witness to an intuition at variance with all these, an intuition that has recognized in woman a commanding factor in the world's progress and given to her thrones of judgment and dominion. True, these concessions have been made to the exceptional woman or in the interest of hereditary kingship—have been made to the Helens, the Deborahs, the Catherine and Elizabeths. But the concession proves the intuition, the more as the women themselves have accepted the positions and filled them creditably. For the rest, there has never been a people, except, perhaps, admitted barbarians, among whom, before marriage, the woman has not only been equal but superior in love. Universal man in all the historic past has been her subject here.

Again, the law in holding women the same as men amenable to punishment as offenders takes a position also at variance with the idea of subjection. It recognizes the individuality of woman, her personal responsibility, and so far contradicts itself whenever it denies, not her right, but her duty to act as an individual in all her relations with him



and society. In truth, the position of woman in the past has been so paradoxical that to a superficial judgment the development in her of a consistent self-consciousness would seem almost miraculous. She has been at once citizen and alien, subject and queen. She has by common consent been responsible for all the evil and the inspiration to all the good that men do. Sentimentally man's superior, practically his inferior, she has been anything rather than what she alone is—his equal. The name woman has been the synonym for all that is contradictory in human character and experience.

But let us inquire into the original bond between man and woman—the bond that determines their relations to each other. To those who accept it, sacred history satisfactorily answers the question. From this source we learn that He who made them in the beginning made them male and female; that the creative bond between them is the bond of marriage admitting of no divorce, because they are no longer two, but one, being joined together by God Himself—that is, creatively. In a relation of essential oneness, such as is contemplated here, there can of course be no subjection of one to the other, no separation between them. They are complementary of each other. They are each for the other quite equally. It is clear, however, that this prospective relation of essential oneness between the individual man and woman presupposes two things—first, a basic marriage in the universal, a marriage of man as man with woman as woman, a marriage in other words of the essentially masculine with the essentially feminine, such a marriage or oneness of interest and work in all their relations with one another as would lay the proper foundation for a marriage or oneness of interest and work in their more important, because commanding relation with each other—commanding because individual marriage though last in front is first in end. It gives the law. As is this relation ideally or actually, such is society, mutually peace-giving and helpful, or the reverse. This prospective relation of essential oneness between the individual man and woman, presupposes a marriage in each individual, an at-one-ment with one's self that would make at-one-ment with one other possible. Christ's words unquestionably refer to a time when, by implication, harmony prevailed on all the planes of our individual and associated life. "In the beginning," He said, "it was not so." Divorce was impossible, because they are made "male and female," the perfect complements of each other.

It may be said that harmony on all the planes of our being would preclude the idea of government as we know it, the need of contending parties and of the ballot to decide which one shall rule. This, in a sense, is true. Our idea of government, under these conditions, would change undoubtedly. As we know it, government means not the love of service, but the love of dominion; and this, if my premise is correct, came about first through defection in the individual from a state of at-one-ment in himself, and then as a consequence by the departure of the individual man and woman from the idea of mutual service in their relations with each other.

Original
Bond between
Man and Wo-
man.

Departure
from the True
Idea.

The proof that the premise is correct will, I think, appear when we conclude what society of necessity would be were the idea of service the only ruling idea in the marriage relation of today. Of course, our individual and social experiences keep pace with each other. We realize simultaneously on both planes. And the social acts upon as well as reacts toward the individual. But the individual gives the law. According to sacred history, then, marriage, a relation of perfect oneness or equality, a complementary relation, precluding the idea of separation or subjection, is the original bond between individual men and women, because it is the bond between masculine and feminine principles in the individual mind. But marriage, as we have seen, means harmony, and we have discord in ourselves and in our relations with each other. How, then, came the departure from the true idea? The separation, we are told, dates from Eden and the sin of Eve, and one of the consequences of the sin is recorded, not, however, as the vindicating judgment of the Almighty, but as the fact merely in the so-called curse upon the woman for listening to the voice of the serpent. "He—thy husband—shall rule over thee."

Let us for a moment consider this fact in its relation to the individual mind. For all truth is true for us primarily as individuals. What we are to others depends upon what we are to ourselves. We have, then, in this declaration, a case not of marriage, but of divorce. The mind is at variance with itself. One part rules, the other must obey. For the mind, like man and woman, is dual, and is one only in marriage. It is a discordant, too, when we love what the truth forbids, and a harmonious, complementary one when we love what the truth enjoins. By common perception, love is the feminine and truth the masculine principle. Love, when it is the love of self, leads us astray. It led us astray as a race. It blinded us to the real good. Truth brings us back to our moorings. But it can only do so by its temporary supremacy over love. This is all we know. Our desires must be subject to our knowledge. History repeats the story of our individual experience in larger character in the relation between man and woman. Each is an individual, that is, each is both masculine and feminine in himself and herself, but in their relations to each other man stands for and expresses truth in his form and activities, while woman stands for and expresses love. Here, also, as in the individual, the original bond is marriage, implying no subjection on the part of either wife or husband, implying on the contrary perfect oneness, mutual and equal helpfulness. But except in the symbolic story of Edenic peace and happiness, none the less true, however, because merely symbolic, we have no historic record of that infantile experience of the race.

Love, when it is good, unites the truth in herself. But when it is the love of evil or self, she divorces truth and unites herself with the false. This briefly is the meaning of the separation between man and woman in the past; namely, first, the degradation of love into self-love, and the consequent separation between love and truth in the individual

mind, a separation that, blinding us to the highest good, makes it no longer safe for us to follow our desires; second, the separation between man and woman in the marriage relation, and as a farther consequence, between man and man socially.

If what I have already said be true, the prominence which the question of woman suffrage has assumed in the present may be easily understood. Woman suffrage more or less intelligently for the universal intuition of the truth I have tried to present, namely, the truth of the creative oneness of man and woman. Human history, it is true, is the record of a seeming divorce between them. But what God hath joined together man cannot put asunder. Creatively one man and woman cannot be permanently separated. Indeed, their temporary separation is providentially in the interest of their higher ultimate union. We are on our way back to relations between them of which those of our racial infancy were the sure promise and held the potency. Truth divinely implanted in the soul is our leader because truth being essentially separative or critical can, when necessary, lead against desire. We have emerged from infancy and must prove our manhood by overcoming the obstacles to harmony we have ourselves created. First nature without us, always responsive to nature within, is in rebellion and must be subdued. Here again, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" is not a curse but the provision of infinite love for our development, physically and mentally. Nature no longer responds spontaneously to the needs of man, but brings forth thorns and thistles and yields bread only under compulsion of the clay-cold, masculine intellect, which alone is able to master nature's secrets and nature herself. She understands the law of must and submits to the might of masculine muscle.

Woman has apparently no place in this needful preliminary work save to sustain the worker. True, in her representative capacity of love, the highest in both, she is under subjection; yet she sees, not rationally, of course, in the beginning, but intuitively, the reason why, acquiesces, and hidden from view still leads while she follows; still rules in obeying. For love, or its opposite, self-love, is always the very life of man, as love is the life of God who created him. It is always the woman within us that gives first birth, and then responding to the voice of truth and falsity without leads us on and out of the wilderness or sends us back to wander another forty years before we enter our Canaan. Woman, yes, and women are, primarily, even, although sometimes ignorantly, responsible from first to last. It has not always seemed so. The past has been so predominately masculine as seemingly to obliterate the feminine by absorption—to make the man and the woman one, and that one the man. Yet only in seeming. In reality woman has been the inspiration of all that has been done, both good and evil. Tennyson does not see clearly when he says: "As the husband, so the wife is." It is always the other way. It is always the clown within and not without herself that drags a woman down and the man with her.

Rules in
Obeying.

The Voice
Within.

But let us take another step. Our way back involves not only the overcoming of obstacles to harmony of nature without us, the subjugation of nature and the consequent establishment of a scientific consciousness in accord with spiritual truth that harmony for man presupposes his rightful lordship over all below him, it also involves the overcoming of nature within an at-one-ment of man with himself. And here the work is alike for both, in that both are alike subject to truth. In addition, however, she has been externally subject to him. And her temptation has been to identify the voice of truth within herself with his voice, his idea of truth for her. This, when both are led by love, is the true idea for both, since then his voice is the voice of truth. But led by self-love, she, too, must listen to the voice within. And more. She must listen for him as well as for herself. Because so listening she is the very form of embodiment of that love of the truth which alone can lead them back to harmony in themselves with each other and with all others. In other words, so listening she is the revelation of the truth to man.

The legal disfranchisement of woman in the past has been in accordance with the truth for the past. It has been a strict necessity of the situation, a necessity for women as well as for men, and with it in the past we can have no conceivable quarrel. Masculine supremacy, the supremacy of truth, has been needed to lay the foundation of Christian character, and a Christian society in the subjection of nature and self-love. But the foundations broadly and deeply laid in natural and social science, we can at least see that the corresponding superstructure can be after no petty or personal, partial or class pattern, but must be divinely perfect; that is, perfect "according to the measure of a man," of man physical, intellectual and spiritual, of man individual and social, and finally of man feminine as well as masculine. We can at last see that love is the fulfillment of law.

This truth human law must sometimes embody in order to effect its universal acceptance. Beliefs crystallized into creeds and statutes hold the human mind. It is certain that belief in the creative equality of man and woman will not prevail so long as the statute book proclaims the contrary. Neither this nor a practical belief in the creative equality of man and man. This waits upon that, that upon individual enlightenment sufficiently focalized to lead the general mind. A relation of marriage, or, in other words, of mutual co-operation all the way through in all the work of both, is the creative relation between man and woman. It follows that as this truth is seen and realized by individual men and women, society will see the same truth as its own law of life, to be expressed, ultimated in all human relations and in the work of the world. This truth alone will lead us back to harmony in all the planes of our associated life, and the dawning recognition of this truth explains, as I believe, the growing interest in the modern question of woman suffrage.

One objection to a further extension of the right of suffrage has weight. It should have been considered when the negro was admitted

to citizenship. Ignorance is a menace to the state. All women are not intelligent. Certainly there is no reason in advocating educated suffrage. But I know of no other discrimination, except, of course, against criminals and idiots, that can consistently be made against a citizen under a government that professes to derive its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Opinions vary as to the actual effect of the introduction of the woman element into practical politics. It is my own belief, of course, that the prophets of evil will find themselves greatly at fault in their specific prognostications. Woman suffrage does not mean to women the pursuit of politics after the fashion of men. But questions are even now before us, and more will arise, that she should help to decide—questions relating to the saloon, to education, to the little waifs of society worse than orphaned, to prison reforms, to all that side of life that most vitally touches woman as the mother of the race. Women hold, or could hold, intelligent opinions on all such questions; and the state should have the benefit of them.

Woman in
Practical Politics.

Woman suffrage does not mean, as has been charged, a desire on the part of women to be like men or to assume essentially masculine duties or prerogatives. God takes care of that. The inmost desire of the acorn is to become an oak and nothing else. Equally true is it that the soul of woman irresistibly aspires to the fulfillment of its own womanly destiny as wife and mother, and, as a rule, to nothing that definitely postpones such destiny. Most emphatically woman suffrage does not mean any persistent blindness on the part of women to their high calling as the outward embodiment and representative of what is highest and best in human nature. Blind she has been and is, but God is her teacher. He has kept the soul of woman through all the ages of her acquiescent subjection to man. He has led her, and, all unconsciously to Himself, has led man through her up and out upon the high table-land of today; whence both can see the large meaning of subjection in the past, and the larger realizations that await their accordant union in the future.

Imperfectly as she now apprehends it, woman suffrage does, nevertheless, mean for women a consistent, rational sense of personal responsibility, and it means this so pre-eminently that I could almost say that it means nothing else. Because upon this new and higher sense of personal responsibility is to be built all the new and higher relations of woman in the future with herself, with men and with society. This is a theme in itself. I will only say in passing, that we are ready for new and higher relations between men and women, that women must inaugurate these relations, that an intuition of the truth is the secret of the so-called woman movement, of the intellectual awakening of women, of their desire for personal and pecuniary freedom, their laudable efforts to secure such freedom, the sympathy and co-operation of the best men in these efforts and that the bearing of all these aspects of the movement upon the future of society gives us the vision of the poet, true poet and true prophet in one.

Then comes the statelier Eden back to men.
 Then reign the world's great bridal chaste and calm.
 Then springs the crowning race of human kind.

I wish to emphasize the point that, without the consent of woman her subjection could never have been a fact of history. Nothing is clearer to my mind than that man and woman (and because of her, let me insist) have all along been one in their completeness, as they originally were, and one day again will be one in their completeness. In any relation between man and woman, the most perfect as well as the most imperfect, man stands for the external or masculine principle of our common human nature. Thus, of course, women always have, do now, and always will, delight in his external leadership.

Becoming
 Self-supporting.

Now, however, we are confronting another aspect of the relation between man and woman. Under a new impulse, derived from woman herself, man is abdicating his external leadership, his external control over her. She is becoming self-supporting, self-sustaining, self-reliant. She is learning to think and to express her thought, to form opinions and to hold to them. In doing this, she is apparently separating herself from man as in the past he has separated himself from her. Really separating herself, some say, but we need not fear. She is simply doing her part, making herself ready for the new and higher relation with man to which both are divinely summoned. The end to be attained, a perfect relation between man and man, symbolized by, but as yet imperfectly realized in, the divine institution of marriage, involves for its realization equal freedom for both. Not independence on the part of either. No such thing is possible.

Inequality of natural opportunity operates hardly against women. It is against this inequality that she is now struggling on the material and intellectual plane; that they are struggling, let me say, for no reflecting person can for an instant suppose that the woman movement does not include men equally with women. They are one, man and woman, let us continue to repeat, until we have effectually unlearned the contrary supposition. The woman movement means in the divine providence "the hard earned release of the feminine in human nature from bondage to the masculine." It means the leadership henceforth in human affairs of truth, no longer divorced from but one with love. It is the last battleground of freedom and slavery. We are in the dawn of a new and final dispensation. This is why I welcome the struggle for personal freedom on the part of women including her struggle for the right of citizenship. It is altogether a new recognition by what is highest in man of the sacredness of the individual, and it insures the triumph of the new impulse.

The personal freedom of woman when achieved on all planes—material, mental and spiritual—will not separate her from man. It will not harm the woman nature in woman. It will, on the contrary, tend to develop that nature as a fitting complement of the nature of man. It will give her the same opportunity that he has to exercise all

her faculties free from outward constraint. It is distinctive character that we want in both men and women to base true relations between them, and freedom is the only soil in which character will grow. We are still measurably ignorant of the nature of woman in women, of her real capacities, inclinations and powers, nor shall we know these until women are free to express them in accordance with their own ideas, and not, as hitherto, in accordance with man's ideas of them.

In conclusion, there could, of course, be no legal act disenfranchising woman since she was never legally enfranchised. But as it is her divinely conferred privilege to be one with man, the law as it has come to be understood simply stands for something that could not be, and is therefore misleading and vicious. It stands not only for the subjection of woman, which it has had a right to stand for, but it has also come to mean a real and not apparent separation between man and woman. We must bear in mind that this apparent separation is always of the man from the woman, the masculine from the feminine, truth from love.

Personal
Freedom of
Woman.



Letter From Lady Henry Somerset

Read by DR. BARROWS to the Parliament.



EV. DR. JOHN HENRY BARROWS, Chairman of the World's Religious Congresses, Chicago. Honored Friend: You have doubtless been told with fatiguing reiteration, by your worldwide clientele of correspondents that they considered the religious congresses immeasurably more significant than any others to be held in connection with the Columbian Exposition. You must allow me, however, to repeat this statement of opinion, for I have cherished it from the time when I had a conversation with you in Chicago and learned the vast scope and catholicity of the plans whose fulfillment

must be most gratifying to you and your associates, for, with but few exceptions among the religious leaders of the world, there has been, so far as I have heard and read, the heartiest sympathy in your effort to bring together representatives of all those immeasurable groups of men and women who have been united by the magnetism of some great religious principle, or the more mechanical efforts that give visible form to some ecclesiastical dogma. The keynote you have set has already sounded forth its clear and harmonious strain, and the weary multitudes of the world have heard it and have said in their hearts: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it would be if brethren would dwell together in unity!"

Keynote to
Unity.

I have often thought that the best result of this great and unique movement for a truly pan-religious congress was realized before its members met, for in these days the press, with its almost universal hospitality toward new ideas, helps beyond any other agency to establish an equilibrium of the best thought, affection and purpose of the world, and is the only practical force adequate to bring this about.

By nature and nurture I am in sympathy with every effort by which men may be induced to think together along the lines of their agreement rather than of their antagonism, but we all know that it is more easy to get them together than to think together. For this

reason the congresses, which are to set forth the practical workings of various forms of religion, were predestined to succeed, and their influence must steadily increase as intelligent men and women reflect upon the record of the results. It is the earnest hope of thoughtful religious people throughout the world, as all can see who study the press from a cosmopolitan point of view, that out of the nucleus of influence afforded by the congress may come an organized movement for united activity based on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The only way to unite is never to mention subjects on which we are irrevocably opposed. Perhaps the chief of these is the historic Episcopate; but the fact that he believes in this while I do not would not hinder that good and great prelate, Archbishop Ireland, from giving his hearty help to me, not as a Protestant woman but as a temperance worker. The same was true in England of that lamented leader, Cardinal Manning, and is true today of Monsignor Nugent, of Liverpool, a priest of the people, universally revered and loved. A consensus of opinion on the practical outline of the golden rule, declared negatively by Confucius and positively by Christ, will bring us all into one camp, and that is precisely what the enemies of liberty, worship, purity and peace do not desire to see; but it is this, I am persuaded, that will be attained by the great conclave soon to assemble in the White City of the West.

All Into One
Camp.

The congress of religions is the mightiest œcumenical council the world has ever seen; Christianity has from it everything to hope; for as the plains, the tablelands, the foothills, the mountain ranges, all conduct alike, slowly ascending to the loftiest peak of the Himalayas, so do all views of God tend toward and culminate in the character the life and work of Him who said: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

Believe me, yours in humble service for God and humanity.

ISABEL SOMERSET.



The Influence of Religion on Women.

Paper by REV. MRS. ANNIS F. F. EASTMAN, of West Bloomfield, N. Y.



IN Eve, the mother of evil, and Mary, the mother of God, we have the two extremes of religious thought concerning woman. It is worthy of note that neither of these conceptions was peculiar to the Hebrew mind. In the sacred book of the Hindus we have a counterpart of Eve in the nymph Menaka, of whom the man complains, in the spirit of Adam: "Alas, what has become of my wisdom, my prudence, my firm resolution? Behold, all destroyed at once by a woman!"

In the sacred oracles of the Chinese we find these words: "All was subject to man in the beginning. The wise husband raised up a bulwark of walls, but the woman, by an ambitious desire of knowledge, demolished them. Our misery did not come from heaven; she lost the human race." In the religious annals of the Greeks also, we have Pandora, the author of all human ills. Everywhere in the religious history of mankind you will find some trace of the divine woman, mother of the incarnate Deity. On the walls of the most ancient temples in Egypt you may see the goddess mother and her child. The same picture is veiled behind Chinese altars, consecrated in Druid groves, glorified in Christian churches, and in all these the underlying thought is the same. Before entering upon an investigation of the relation of religion to woman, we must decide what we mean by religion.

One Kind of Religion.

If we mean any particular form of faith, body of laws, institutions, organization, whether Hindu, Greek, Hebrew or Christian, then we are forced to the conclusion that no one of these has given to woman an equal place with man as the full half of the unit of humanity; for every organized religion, every religion which has become a human institution, teaches the headship of man and that involves, in some measure and degree, the subjection of woman and her consequent inferiority.





Rev. Annis F. Eastman, West Bloomfield, N. Y.

The Vedas declare that a husband, however criminal or defective, is in the place of the supreme to his wife. Plato presents a state of society wholly disorganized when slaves are disobedient to their masters, and wives on an equality with their husbands. Aristotle characterized women as being of an inferior order, and Socrates asks the pathetic question: "Is there a human being with whom you talk less than with your wife?" Poor Socrates judged the sex, we may imagine, as the modern sage is apt to do, by that specimen with which he was most familiar. Tertullian, one of the most spiritual of the Christian fathers, said: "Submit your head to your husband and you will be sufficiently adorned."

Sentiments of
Leaders.

Luther, dear Father Luther, who builded better than he knew, said: "No gown worse becomes a woman than that she should be wise." A learned bishop of today said: "Man is the head of the family; the family is an organic unity, and cannot exist without subordination. Man is the head of the family because he is physically stronger, and because the family grows out of a warlike state, and to man was intrusted the duties of defense."

These are the sentiments of leaders of the great systems of religious doctrine and they reflect the spirit of organized religion from the beginning until now. If, however, by religion we mean that universal spirit of reverence, fear and worship of a spiritual being or beings, believed to be greater than man, yet in some respects like man; if we mean that almost universal conviction of the race, that there is that in man which transcends time and sense; if we believe that religion is that in man which looks through the things which are that he may be able to perceive the right and choose it; if, in a word, religion be the possibility of the fellowship of the spirit of man with the spirit of God, then its relation to woman, as to man, has been that of inspiring guide to a fuller light.

With this conception of religion we see that it is a matter of growth; the religious life of the race is a matter of growth and education. In seeking to discern what part religion thus conceived has played in the advancement of our race, we must go back of religion to man, because religion was made for man and by man, not man for or by religion; first that which is natural, afterward that which is spiritual. When you have scanned the earliest written records of mankind you have not yet arrived at the root of things. When you find what you believe are the conceptions of the primitive man concerning God and the supernatural world you have not arrived at the roots of things. For his gods, his beliefs, as to the mystery by which he is encompassed, were born of his effort to explain and account for that which is in his own condition and circumstance.

The religions of various peoples, we now see, were not superimposed upon them by God; they were the outgrowth of the actual life of the race. They were an attempt on man's part to explain himself and nature, to answer the question asked him by his own being and the universe without. Woman's religious position, therefore, in any

nation, is only the supernatural or religious sanction put upon her actual position in that nation. Among primitive peoples she is always a drudge, a chattel, a mere possession, her only actual value being that of the producer of man.

Antecedent
Causes.

This state of things, of course, had its antecedent causes, which we may trace in that seemingly blind struggle for existence which prevailed among the owners of animals below man, out of which one type after another emerged because of superior strength or more perfect adaptation to environment. Here we find the foundations of that physical and mental inferiority of the female which has been the reason of woman's position in human society in all times. A foremost scientist says: "The superiority of male mammals is a remarkable fact. It is due to causes little creditable to the male character in general. Not one particle of it is attributable to their noble efforts in protection and supporting the females and their own offspring. It is the result of a sexual selection growing out of the struggle between the males for the possession of the females." This simple scientific fact might well be commended to the theologian who argues the natural subjection of woman through what he is pleased to call the purposes of nature as seen in the lower orders of life.

You are familiar with the argument that the male bird sings louder and sweeter than the female; therefore, a woman cannot be a poet. In most mammals the male is larger, more beautiful, more sagacious than the female, and is exempt from most of the unpleasant labors connected with the rearing and defense of the young; therefore, a woman cannot understand politics. You can easily find instances, if you like, in natural history of what we might call nature's favoritism of the female. Why do you not speak of the ostrich, the male of which sits on the eggs, hatches out the young and takes principal care of them? Why do you not instance that fine, beautiful variety of spider of which the female invariably devours her consort when he is of no further use to her? What if that custom should become prevalent among women?

The fact is that these things prove nothing. If we have made any progress, it is away from nature. We are not spiders, nor lions, nor birds. We are man, male and female, and we want to be angels, or we used to when we went to Sunday-school. It is unworthy of us to go back to the conduct of life among the lower animals to bolster up any of the remaining abuses of human society. The point is just here. We cannot trace the degraded and subject position of woman in ancient times to the religious ideals of her nature and place in the creation, but the reverse is true in a large measure. We can trace her religious position to her actual position in primitive society, and this in its turn back to those beginnings of the human animal which science is just beginning to discover and which will probably always be matter of speculation.

We always find the position of woman improving, as warlike activities are replaced by industrial activities. When war and the chase were

the sole questions of human kind, the qualities required in these formed their chief measure of excellence. The position of woman in ancient Egypt, in her most brilliant period, was higher than in many a modern state. Egypt was an industrial state when we knew it first. Herbert Spencer says: "There are no people, however refined, among whom the relative position of the man and woman is more favorable than with the Laps. It is because the men are not warriors. They have no soldiers; they fight no battles, either with outside foreigners or between the various tribes and families. In spite of their wretched huts, dirty faces, primitive clothing, their ignorance of literature, art and science, they rank above us in the highest element of true civilization—the moral element—and all the military nations of the world may stand uncovered before them."

The Moral
Element.

The same writer points out the fact that woman's position is more tolerable when circumstances lead to likeness of occupation between the sexes. Among the Cheroops, who live upon fish and roots which the women get as readily as the men, the women have an influence very rare among Indians. Modern history also teaches us that when women become valuable in a commercial sense they are treated with a deference and respect which is as different from the sentimental adoration of the poet as from the haughty contempt of the philosopher.

Another important influence in the advancement of woman as of man is the influence of climate. It is a general rule, subject of course to some exceptions, that a tropical climate tends to degrade woman by relaxing her energy and exposing her purity. The relatively high regard in which woman was held by some of the tribes of the north of Europe, the strictures of the marriage bond in the case of the man as well as the woman, may be partially explained by climatic influences, though among these people, as among all barbarians, woman was under the absolute authority of husband or guardian, and could be bought, sold, beaten and killed. Yet she was the companion of his labors and dangers—his counselor. She had part of all his wars, encouraging men in battle and inspiring even dying soldiers with new zeal for victory.

Influence of
Climate.

Every religion is connected with some commanding personality and takes from him and his teachings its general trend and spirit, but in its onward course of blessing and conquest it soon incorporates other elements from the peoples who embrace it. Thus Buddhism is not the simple outgrowth of the teachings of Buddha. Organized Christianity is not the imitation of the life and teachings of Christ among His followers. Christianity is the teaching of Jesus, plus Judaism, plus the Roman spirit of law and justice and Grecian philosophy, plus the ideals of medieval art, plus the nature of the Germanic races, plus the scientific spirit of the modern age.

It would be interesting to balance the gains and losses of a religion in their various transitions, but it is aside from our purpose to get at the true genius of a religion. We must go back to the teaching of

its founders, and in every instance we find these teachings far in advance of the average life of the peoples among whom they arose.

Equal in
Spiritual
Things.

No one can study the words of Buddha, of Zoroaster, Confucius, Mohammed and Moses without seeing a divine life and spirit in them which is not a reflection from the state of society in which they lived. Charity is the very soul of Buddhist teaching. "Charity, courtesy, benevolence, unselfishness are to the world what the linch-pin is to the rolling chariot."

Buddha declared the equality of the male and female in spiritual things. The laws of Moses exalt woman. The Elohist, or more strictly Jewish account of creation, puts male and female on a level. So God created man in His own image—in the image of God created He him—male and female created He them, and the Lord blessed them. Christ said: "Whosoever doth the will of God, the same is My brother and sister and mother." Did He not teach here that spiritual values are the only real and elementary ones, and that oneness of spirit and purpose was a stronger tie than that of blood? Is not this also the teaching when He says: "Call no man father; one is your father. No man master; one is your master."

In that declaration which we quoted before, "The Sabbath was made for man," is the magna charta of man's freedom and headship, male and female. The Sabbath was the chief institution of the Jews, their holy of holies, whose original significance was so overlaid with the priestly laws and prohibitions that it had become a hindrance to right. It was a machine in which the life was caught and torn and destroyed. Christ says: "Sabbath was made for man." So all institutions, all creeds, everything, was made, planned and devised for man. The life is the fruit, and if any institution, any right or form or deed is found to be hampering and hindering, the growing life or spirit of man wants to cast it off, even as Christ defied the man-made laws of His people when He healed the man with the withered hand.

In His declaration of the supremacy of love, when He foretold that He, the supreme lover of the soul, once lifted up should draw all men unto Himself, He sounded the death knell of the reign of force in the earth and destroyed, by cutting its roots, that headship of man which grows out of the warlike state of human society.

His Silence
Golden.

If Christ's speech was silver, His silence was golden. He simply ignores the distinctions of rank and class and race and sex among men. He has nothing to say about manly virtues and womanly virtues but, "Blessed are the meek," not meek women; "Blessed are the merciful," "the pure in heart." Paul commends the wife to submission to the master husband, which was the sentence of the world upon woman in his day. But in that Gospel which gave her Christ, her lot was unfolded with the germ of that independence and equality of woman with man, which is beginning to blossom and bear fruit in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Christ declared eternal principles. He did not invent them; they were always true. Men make systems good, serving a valuable pur-

pose, but they have their day and cease to be. If it be urged that the progress of Christianity since Christ's day has often seemed to be backward from His ideal, in reference to the man and the woman, there is but one answer, and that is, that Christianity, as He proclaimed it, soon became mingled with Jewish and Grecian philosophy and received the impress of the Romans and the different peoples that embraced it; yet all the time it was slowly molding the race to its own heavenly pattern, while today the principles of Jesus are finding new presentations and confirmations in the scientific spirit of this generation. They are not only in full accord with the revelations of science concerning man's beginning, but when science and religion seek to point out the lines on which the farther advance of the race must be found, they say at once: Love is the fulfilling of the law.

There are two ways of reading history. One way is to get the facts and draw your conclusions from them. The other is to make your case first and search the history of mankind for facts to support it. The latter is the more popular way. These two ways place themselves before me as I endeavor to trace the influence of Christianity on woman's development, or of religion on woman's development. If I could only make up my mind that religion had been her greatest boon, or her greatest curse, then the matter of proving either might be easier. When I began the research on this subject my mind was absolutely unprejudiced. I studied the history of the religious life of mankind as I would study any subject. I found religion to be one of the factors in the human problem, like war, or like climate. I found also that it was impossible to separate the influence of religion upon woman from its influence upon man. For neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man. There is no man's cause that is not woman's, and no woman's cause that is not man's. If religion has been a beneficent influence to man, it has been to woman in like manner, though it could not raise her at once to his level, because it found her below him.

Two Ways of
Reading His-
tory.

The fact is that men and women must rise or sink together. It is true in this matter as in all. The letter killeth; the spirit maketh to live. The letter of religion as contained in bodies of doctrine, in ceremonial laws, in all those things pertaining to the religious life which come with observation, has in all ages been hampering and hindering man's progress, male and female. But the spirit of religion which recognizes religion as the spirit of man and binds it to the infinite spirit, which acknowledges the obligation of man to God and to his fellows, which brings man finally under spiritual attunement with Him who is neither man nor woman, the Christ of God—this is at once the most perfect flower of man's progress. Of the relation of woman to religion as the interpreter of its profoundest truths, there is no time to speak. Of the growing dependence of organized Christianity upon woman, there is no need to speak. Her works speak for her.

Must Rise or
Sink Together.



Mosque of Mahmoudieh.

The Women of India.

Paper by MISS JEANNE SORABJI, of Bombay.



WOULD ask you to travel with me in thought over thirteen thousand miles across the seas to have a glimpse at India, the land of glorious sunsets, the continent inhabited by peoples differing from each other almost as variously as their numbers in language, caste and creed, and yet I may safely say I can hear voices in concord from my country saying: "Tell the women of America we are being enlightened, we thirst after knowledge and we are awakening to the fact that there is no greater pleasure than that of increasing our information, training our minds and reaching after the goal of our ambitions." It has been said to me more than once in America that the women of my country prefer to be ignorant and in seclusion; that

they would not welcome anybody who would attempt to change their mode of life. To these I would give answer, as follows: The nobly born ladies, Zananas, shrink, not from thirst for knowledge, but from contact with the outer world. If the customs of the country, their castes and creeds allowed it, they would gladly live as other women do. They live in seclusion; not ignorance. Highly cultured British women, with love for the Master burning in their hearts, have the exceptional privilege of being their companions and teachers, and they have marveled at the intelligence of some of them.

Effect of
Castes and
Creeds.

'Tis religion that does give
Sweetest comfort.

These secluded ladies make perfect business women. They manage their affairs of state with a grace and manner worthy consideration. Do we wish these women to give up seclusion and live as other women do? Let us, the Christian women of the world, give up to our high and holy calling in Christ Jesus; let our lights shine out brilliantly, for it is the life that speaks with far greater force than any words from our lips, and let us with solemnity grasp the thought that


we may be obstacles in the paths of others. Are we living what we preach about? Do we know that some one is better for our being in the world? If not, why is it not so? Let us attend to our lamps and keep them burning.

The women of India are not all secluded, and it is quite a natural thing to go into homes and find that much is being done for the uplifting of women. Schools and colleges are open where the women may attain to heights at first thought impracticable. The Parsee and Brahman women in Bombay twenty years ago scarcely moved out of their houses, while today they have their libraries and reading rooms, they can converse on politics, enjoy a conversation and show in every movement culture and refinement above the common. Music, painting, horsemanship come as easily to them as spelling the English language correctly. The princes of the land are interesting themselves in the education of the women around them. Foremost among these is the Maharajah, of Mysore, who has opened a college for women, which has for its pupils Hindu ladies, maidens, matrons and widows of the highest caste. This college is superintended by an English lady and has all the departments belonging to the ladies' colleges of Oxford and Cambridge of England. It is the only college where the zither, the vena and the violin are taught. The founder had to work three long years before he was able to introduce these instruments, for the simple reason that these nobly born high caste women associated the handling of musical instruments with the stage and women of no repute.

Schools and
Colleges for
Women.

There are schools and colleges for women in Bombay, Poona and Guzerap; also Calcutta, Alahabad, Missoorie and Madras. The latter college has rather the lead in some points by conferring degrees upon women. The Victoria high school has turned out grand and noble women, so also has the new high school for women in the native city of Poona. These schools have Christian women as principals. The college of Ahrmedabad has a Parsee (Christian) lady at its head. What women have done women can do.

Do you wish to see purity as white as the driven snow in woman? Allow me to bring before you in thought, that form of a beautiful woman of India, the Pundita Ramabai, who has opened the Sharida Sadan, or widow's home, in India. She has traveled a great deal, and was in America for awhile, taking from you sympathy, affection and funds for her noble work. Do you wish to hear of learned women? Again let me mention the Pundita Ramabai and in companionship with her Cornelia Sorabji, B. A., LL. D. Men and women have written of these in prose and song; their morality is unquestionable, their religion beautiful (for they belong to Christ Jesus), their humility proverbial. These are women for a nation to be proud of. Having prepared themselves to fill important posts they have gone back to their country and their life to glorify their Maker. These good women must have had good mothers. I can speak of one who lives the life of which she is so great an advocate; with her godliness and refinement go



hand in hand; her faith in God is wonderful and her children will look back in years to come and call her blessed. There are others worthy of your notice, the poet Sumibai Goray, the physician, Dr. Anandibai Joshi, whom death removed from our midst just as she was about starting her grand work, and the artist of song, Mme. Therze Langrana, whose God-given voice thrills the hearts of men and women in London. My countrywomen have been at the head of battles, guiding their men with word and look of command. My countrywomen will soon be spoken of as the greatest scientists, artists, mathematicians and preachers of the world.

Instead of the absurd saying, "a woman is at the bottom of every evil," let us rather say all great works are due to good women, noble women, true women, pure women, the greatest as well as the least of God's creatures.

Greatest of
God's Creat-
ures.

A woman? Yes, I thank the day,
When I was made to live,
To cast a bright or shining ray,
To love, to live, to give;
To draw aside from paths of sin,
The halt, the lame, the blind;
A woman, glorious, noble, grand,
A woman I would be,
To live, to conquer, to command,
To lessen misery.
To glorify, in word, in deed,
The Maker I adore!
To help regardless caste or creed,
The sad, the lone, the poor.



A New Testament Woman; or, What Phœbe Did.

Paper by MISS MARION MURDOCH, of Cleveland, Ohio.



IN the sixteenth chapter of Romans, first and second verses, is found the following: "I commend unto you Phœbe, our sister, who is a servant (or deaconess) of the church that is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she hath been a succorer of many, and of mine own self also."

It is not surprising that this passage in Paul's epistle to the Romans should be of peculiar interest. Paul's reputation as an opponent of the public work of women is well known. For many centuries he has been considered as the chief opposer of any activity, official or otherwise, of women in the churches. They were to keep silence, he said. They were not to teach or to talk or to preach. They were to ask no questions except in the privacy of their homes. Paul merely shared the popular opinion of his time when he exclaimed with all his customary logic, "Man is the glory of God, but woman is the glory of the man!" Either proposition, standing by itself, meets our hearty approval. "Man is the glory of God!" Woman is, we are told, "the glory of man." But combining them with that adversative particle, we feel that Paul's doctrine of the divine humanity with reference to woman is not quite sound according to the present standard. Because we have come to feel that woman may be also the glory of God, we call Paul prejudiced. We even refuse to take him as authority upon social questions, and skip the passages in the epistles where he writes upon this subject.

Paul Digres-
sion.

But here in this sixteenth chapter of Romans we notice a digression from the general doctrines of Paul in this direction. "I commend unto you Phœbe, our sister, who is a servant (or deaconess) of the



Miss Marion Murdoch, Cleveland, Ohio.

church which is at Cenchrea." I use the word deaconess or deacon because the Greek term is the same as that translated deacon elsewhere, and the committee on the new version have courageously put "or deaconess" into the margin.

By Paul's own statement, then, Phœbe was deaconess of Paul's church at Cenchrea. Cenchrea was one of the ports of Corinth in northern Greece. This epistle to the Romans was written at Corinth and sent to Rome by Phœbe. It was nearly a thousand miles by sea from Cenchrea, and this was one of the most important and one of the ablest of all Paul's letters. Yet he sent it over to Rome by this woman official of the church and said: "I commend unto you Phœbe. Receive her in the Lord as becometh saints and assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you; for she has been a succorer of many and of myself also."

A Succorer of
Many.

I have thought, therefore, that it might be interesting to ask ourselves the question, What did Phœbe do? supplementing it with some references to the Phœbes of today. What was it that so overcame this prejudice of Paul's that he gave her a hearty testimonial and sent her over on important business to the church at Rome? It is evident that, notwithstanding all the obstacles which custom had placed about her, she had been actively at work. It is doubtful whether she even asked if popular opinion would permit her service to the church.

She saw that help was needed and she went eagerly to work. She was, we may imagine, a worker full of enthusiasm for the faith, active and eager to lend a hand in the direction in which she thought her service was most needed. Knowing the prejudice of her time, she doubtless acted in advance of custom rather than in defiance of it. Any bold or defiant attitude would have displeased Paul, for he must have been very sensitive in this direction. She was wise enough to know that if she quietly made herself useful and necessary to the church, custom would stand back and Paul would come forward to recognize her. We may suppose that she felt a deep interest in sustaining this church at Cenchrea. She knew, without doubt, the great aspirations of Paul for those churches.

In Advance of
Custom.

Something like a dream of a church universal had entered the mind of this apostle to the Gentiles. His speech at Mars Hill was a prophecy of a parliament of religions. And his earnest, reproving question, "Is God not the God of Gentiles also?" has taken nearly two thousand years for its affirmative answer by Christendom, in America. Yes. Paul recognized that all the world he knew had some perception of the Infinite. But he knew that this perception must have its effect upon the moral life or it would be a mockery indeed. And there was much wickedness all about. We see by the letters of Paul, as well as by history, how corrupt and lawless were many of the customs both in Greece and Rome. Much service was needed. And here was a woman in Cenchrea who could not sit silent and inactive and see all this. She, too, must work for a universal church. She, too, must bring religion into the life of humanity. Realizing that it was her duty

to help, she entered into this beautiful service, we doubt not, as if it were the most natural thing in the world to do

"She has been a succorer of many," said Paul. In what ways she aided them we need not definitely inquire. It may have been by kind encouragement or sympathy; it may have been by pecuniary assistance, or active social or executive plans for the struggling church. Whatever it was, Phœbe possessed the secret. "She has been a succorer of many, and of myself also," said Paul. To Phœbe, therefore, has been accorded the honor of aiding and sustaining this heroic man, whom we have dreamed was strong enough to endure alone the perils by land and sea, poverty, pain, temptation for the cause he loved.

And when Paul had intrusted her with this letter to the Romans, how cordial must have been her reception by the church at Rome, bearing, as she did, not only this epistle, but this hearty recognition of her services by their beloved leader. Yet, with what a smile of perplexity and incredulity must the grave elders of the church have looked upon this woman-deacon whom Paul requested them to assist in whatsoever business she had in hand. This business transacted by the aid of the society at Rome, Phœbe went home, full of suggestions and plans, we may imagine, for her cherished Grecian church.

We must remember that it required no small effort and skill to sustain societies in these various places. Paul often preached without compensation, as we know, working at his trade to support himself and receiving contributions from interested friends. There was constant need of money and effort. What did Phœbe do in such a case? Did she sit quietly and helplessly down because she was a woman, with a church needing service and Paul needing money?

If she was not able to assist financially, I am sure she went out to urge the people to action and to insist upon united effort, and to show each and every one that he, or she, should have a personal responsibility in the matter. I can imagine that she even arose in church meeting, after the final adjournment, but right in the presence of Paul, and told the people the blessedness of giving and serving. "Nothing good," she would say, "can be sustained without effort. Let us work together, women and men, for our cause and our children's cause here in Cenchrea." Such was undoubtedly this woman whom Paul was constrained to honor. In spite of all restrictions and social obstacles, in the face of unyielding custom and prejudice, she could yet arise to work earnestly for her church, transact its business, extend its influence and be recognized as one of its most efficient servants.

Yet, notwithstanding this public work of a woman, and Paul's plain encouragement of it, the letter of his law was the rule of the churches for many centuries, and it forbade the sisters from uttering their moral or religious word in the sanctuaries, or doing public service of any sort for their own and their brother's cause. But here and there arose the Phœbes, who asked no favors of custom, but insisted on giving the service they could, in every way they could; giving it with such zeal and spirit that people forgot that there was sex in sainthood, and whispered that perhaps they also were called of God.

Cordial
reception.

Sex in Saint-
hood.

"It's easy enough," said Angy Plummer in that charming story of the Elder's Wife; "It's easy enough to know how it is, Sis Kinney is a kind of daughter of God, something as Jesus Christ was His Son. It's just the way Jesus used to go round among folks, as near as I can make out. And I, for one, don't believe that God just sent Him once for all, and ain't never sent anybody else near us all this time. I reckon He's sending down sons and daughters to us oftener than we think."

"Angy Plummer," exclaimed her mother, "I call that down right blasphemy." "Well, call it what you're a mind to," said Angy, "it's what I believe."

And so as the years went on there came a growing recognition of the "daughters of God." The world gradually accepted the thought expressed by our new translators in that tender letter of John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," was the good old way; "Beloved, now are we the children of God," is the better new one. The recognition grew greater in word as well as spirit, the call was more earnest for the active co-operation of the Phœbes in all the non-official work of the churches, and the Phœbes everywhere responded to the call.

Recognition
of the Daughters
of God.

But not until the inauguration of a radically new movement in religion were the official barriers in some degree removed. Not until the emphasis was put upon that divine love of God, which would save all creatures, upon that mother heart of Deity which would enfold all its children; not until the emphasis was put upon the spirit rather than the letter of Bible literature, upon the free rather than the restricted revelations of God, upon the Holy Spirit in the human soul without regard to sex or time or place, not until all this was proclaimed and emphasized did the Phœbes ask or receive official recognition in the ministry.

And it was better so. Under the old dispensation they would have been strangely out of place; under the new it is most fitting that they should be called and chosen. Our modern Pauls are now gladly ordaining them, and the brethren are receiving them in the Lord, as becomes the saints. Now may they also be the glory of God and partakers of the spirit; now may the words of Joel be at last fulfilled: "And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy."

Still there are limitations and restrictions in words. Reforms in words always move more slowly than reforms in ideas. It is wonderful how we fear innovations in language. Even in appellations of the All-Spirit that John reverently named Love, including in that moment of his inspiration the All-Human in the All-Divine Heart, even here we are often sternly limited to certain gender. Dr. Bartol, of Boston, says reprovingly, "Many hold that the simple name of Father is enough. They seem unconscious that there is in their moral idea of Deity any desideratum or lack. But does this figure, drawn from a single human relation, cover the whole ground? Is there no motherhood in God?"

But, thank heaven, it is no longer heresy, as it was in Boston less than a century ago, to say, with Theodore Parker, "God is our infinite Mother. She will hold us in her arms of blessedness and beauty forever and ever."

But what matter the name so we cling to the idea, the ideal of strength and tenderness for the All-Spirit and for the children of the All-Spirit? What matter so we remember that it is not man or woman in the Lord, nor man or woman in the Spirit, neither in the ministry of the Spirit? It is divine; it is human unity.

Woman's Influence Needed

I have referred to the official ministry for the Phœbes as an assured fact in our growing civilization, but this is only a small part of the work which they are called upon to do. It is found that many, very many, in our churches are as capable of efficient work as this woman helper of Cenchrea, and as truly ministers and apostles as any that were ever ordained to the formal ministry. It is found that there is needed not only woman's large moral and spiritual influence, but her large tact and management in many directions. In philanthropic work woman has always been active. "In the broad fields of human helpfulness," says Mr. Hale, "her empire is like that of the Queen of Palmyra, one that knows no natural limits, but is broad as the genius that can devise and the power that can win." But this church of the new dispensation includes all philanthropy in religion. It includes everything that reforms and purifies and strengthens home and society. To the Phœbes, then, should it be dear as life, because it sustains and ennobles life; sacred as home, because it beautifies and sanctifies the home.

At the Pulpit.

Here are we today in the era of a great reformation. It is a reformation not local, not limited to a section or a sect. It reaches over the civilized world and into the various activities of life. It is a reformation which, while it breaks many idols, is to bring about a pure and more enlightened worship; it is to give freedom to reason and faith; it is to proclaim a constant revelation of God; it is to make, by its doctrine of the divine humanity, a sanctuary of every home and of every heart. It is to show that the ideal of eternity must enter into the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of earth as well; that theology must have for its highest thought the symbol of both fatherhood and motherhood; that incarnated divinity must include in every sense woman as well as man. Not until we have this co-operation of men and women in all the sacred services and offices of the church and of life will the real unity in religion be realized. Woman must stand at the pulpit and behind the altar of God before we shall hear all sides of sacred and secret moral questions. If we have women at the confessional under the new order, we shall have women to receive the confession. We shall have no dividing of the virtues.

Upon all the sacred events of life, in birth, in marriage, in death, we shall have woman's divine benediction; we shall have co-operation along all the lines of life and society; we shall have a full realization of that unity, human and divine, which this parliament of religions has so grandly indorsed.



What Judaism Has Done for Women.

Paper by MISS HENRIETTA SZOLD, of Baltimore.



RIEFLY, the whole education conferred by Judaism lies in the principle that it did not assign to woman an exceptional position; yet, by taking cognizance of the exceptional position assigned to woman by brute force, or occupied by her on account of her physical constitution and natural duties, Judaism made that education effectual and uninterrupted in its effects. It would, indeed, be possible to begin with our own Emma Lazarus, distinguished for gifts alike of heart and brain, and pass upward through history, mounting from Jewish woman's achievement to Jewish woman's achievement, our path marked by poetesses, martyrs, scholars, queens and prophetesses, until we reach the wilds of our patriarchs.

Yet, by these last only may we hope to be taught about Jewish women. In Jewish history, as in that of the rest of mankind, leaders in politics, in thought, in spiritual endeavor are only milestones. They but indicate the categories of phenomena that deserve attention. Nor do I conceive that it would be a help to dwell upon the acknowledged virtues of the modern Jewish women, which shine out upon us from the darkness of medieval prejudice and glorify the humblest home of the Jew in squalid ghetto. That has been fulsomely treated. We wish to know, as it were, the ancestry of such steadfast, incorruptible virtue. Moreover, Judaism is so compact a system that it is hazardous to speak of any kind of faith. By reason of its conservatism it requires more inexorability than any other system. Our question calls for the spiritual data about the typical women whom Judaism has prepared for nineteenth century work. To discover them we must go back to 1,900 years ago to the women of the time of Abraham

Abraham stands out in the historic picture of mankind as the typical father. He it was of whom it was known that he would command his children and his household after him that they should keep the

A Compact
System.



Miss Henrietta Szold, Baltimore, Md.

way of the Lord to do righteousness and justice. What was Sarah's share in this paramount work of education? Ishmael was to be removed in order that Isaac, the disciple of righteousness and justice, might not be lured away from the way of the Lord. In connection with this plan, wholly educational in its aims, it is enjoined upon Abraham: "In all that Sarah may say unto thee, hearken unto her voice."

The next generation again illustrates, not the sameness in function, but equality in position of man and woman. Isaac and Rebecca differ in their conception of educational discipline and factors. But Rebecca, more energetic than her husband, follows up sentiment and perception with practical action. She makes effectual her conviction that mankind will be blessed through the gentleness of Jacob, while Esau's rule means relapse into barbarism.

Rebecca's
Practical Action.

From the trend of the story we may infer that there must have been much unwholesome discussion between father and mother about the comparative merits of the two favorites, and the methods of bringing up children in general. There is an echo in Rebecca's plaint: "I am weary of my life, because of the daughters of Heth," whom Esau had married. "If Jacob," she continues, "takes a wife from the daughters of Heth such as these, from the daughters of the land, what good will life do me?" And although we are told earlier in the narrative that the wives of Esau "were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebecca," it is only after he has been prodded by his wife's words that Isaac charges Jacob: "Thou shalt not take a wife from the daughters of Canaan." Finally, whatever may have been the difference of opinion between them in regard to their children's affairs, before their children father and mother are completely at one, for when the first suspicion of displeasure comes to Esau it reaches him in Isaac's name alone. We are told that "then saw Esau that the daughters of Canaan were evil in the eyes of Isaac, his father." (Gen. xxviii, 6.) Isaac, the executive, had completely adopted the tactics of Rebekah, the advisory branch of the government.

The scene, moreover, is remarkable by reason of the fact that we are shown the first social innovator, the first being to act contrary to tradition and the iron-bound customs of society. Rebekah refuses to yield to birth its rights, in a case in which were involved the higher considerations of the guardianship of truth. And this reformer was a traditionally conservative woman. Rebekah is, indeed, the most individual of the women of patriarchal days, both in her feminine attractions and inner womanly earnestness. To her strong character, it is doubtless due, that Isaac became a strict monogamist, thus perhaps making, by the side of Abraham's and Jacob's numerous additions to civilization's work, his sole positive contribution to its advance.

Such are the ideals of equality between man and woman that have come down to us from the days of the Patriarchs. We hear of the mothers of the greatest men, of Yochebed, the mother of Moses, and of Hannah, the mother of Samuel, and the sole director of his earthly

Evidence of
Woman's Dignity.

career. We still read of fathers and mothers acting in equal conjunction, as in the disastrous youth of Sampson. The law ranges them together: "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, who hearkeneth not to the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and they chastise him, and he will not hearken unto them: Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him." (Deut. xxi, 18, 19.) It is sufficient to indicate a king's evil character to say: "For a daughter of Ahab had he for a wife" (II Kings viii, 18), attesting abundantly a wife's influence, though it be for evil. Nor could Abigail's self-confidence (I Sam. xxv) have been a sporadic phenomenon, without precedent in the annals of Jewish households. Finally, we have a most striking evidence of woman's dignity in the parallel drawn by the prophets between the relation of Israel to God and that of a wife to her husband, most beautifully in this passage which distinguishes between the husband of a Jewish woman and the lord of a medieval Griseldis: "And it shall happen at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi (my husband) and shalt not call me any more Ba'ali (my lord). And I will betroth thee unto me forever: Yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in justice, and in loving kindness, and in mercy. And I will betroth thee unto me in faithfulness." (Hosea ii, 18, 21, 22.)

Folly of
Worshipping
Strange Gods.

But Israel was a backsliding nation. Even its crowning glory, purity of family life, was sullied, as for instance at Gibeah (Judges xx), and by David (2 Sam. xi, xii). In the process of time, Israel came into contact with strange nations, with their strange Gods and their strange treatment of women. It went after idols whose worship consisted of unchaste rites. Israel's sons married the daughter not of the stranger, but of a strange God. It was the Israelite's crown of distinction that his wife was his companion, whose equality was so acknowledged that he made with her a covenant. But this crown was dragged in the mire when he married the daughter of the strange God. Direst misfortune taught Israel the folly of worshipping strange Gods, but the blandishments of the daughters of a strange God produced the enactment of many a law by the rabbis of the Talmud. Here was the problem that confronted them: Israel's ideals of womanhood were high, but the nations around acted up to a brutal standard, and Israel was not likely to remain untainted. Thus Mosaic legislation recognizes the exceptional position occupied by woman, and profits by its knowledge thereof to lay down stringent regulations ordering the relation of the sexes.

We have the rights of woman guarded with respect to inheritance, to giving in marriage in the marriage relation, and with regard to divorce. The maid servant, the captive taken in war, the hated wife, the first wife to be dethroned by a successor—they all are remembered and protected. But woman's greatest safeguard lay in the fact that both marriage and divorce among the Jews were civil transactions, connected with a certain amount of formality. We hear of the bill of divorcement as early as the times of Moses. Marriage was preceded

in some cases by the space of a whole year, during which the woman remained with her father, by the making of a contract of betrothal which in every way was as binding as the act of marriage itself. Thus Malachi's expression, "the wife of thy covenant," was not an empty phrase. It indicates a substantial reality; and at the same time emphasizes the difference between Israel's well regulated moral household and the irregularities and violences of heathen lands.

This, then, was the Jewish basis upon which the rabbis could and did build. The subject of marriage and divorce is by them considered so important that one whole treatise out of the six constituting the Mishnah is devoted to it. But its treatment is so multifarious and exhaustive that only a very skilled Talmudist and an equally systematic mind would be able to arrange all the details under satisfactory heads sufficiently to give it a just idea of its admirable perfection. I am not able to do more than give some instances and some laws in order to illustrate how the rabbis accept woman's exceptional position, and by so doing to shield her from wrong and protect her in her right.

Marriage and
Divorce.

The marriage contract assured to the wife a certain sum of money, the minimum being fixed by law, in the case of the death of her husband, or divorce. This contract had to be duly signed and properly drawn up. Moreover, a widow is entitled to this minimum sum even though no mention is made thereof in the contract. With regard to the position of a married woman the rule was: The wife rises with the husband, but does not descend with him. The expenses of a woman's funeral, for instance, are regulated by the position of her husband; if his is superior her's is superior. A husband must provide his wife with food and raiment; is obliged to ransom her if she is taken captive, and owes her decent burial. A wife's duties are also defined. She must grind, bake bread, wash the linen, nurse her children, make her husband's bed and work in wool. If she has a servant at her disposal she is not obliged to grind, nor to bake bread, nor to wash the linen. Her work diminishes with the number of servants at her beck and call. If she has four she need do nothing. Even if she had a hundred servants her husband may exact spinning from her, for idleness leads to wicked thought. Rabbi Simon says: "If a husband has vowed that his wife shall do no work, he is obliged to divorce her, and pay her her dowry, for idleness may bring about mental alienation." This last dread of idleness throws light upon the praise accorded the virtuous woman: "The bread of idleness she doth not eat." Furthermore, there are regulations fixing the wife's right to property, her husband's claims upon it, as upon what she may earn; even the girl in her father's home could own property, of which she could dispose as she wished. A man with one wife could marry a second only with the consent of the first—a most potent measure for resisting polygamy.

The laws and regulations of divorce are equally full and detailed. A passage often quoted in order to give an idea of the Jewish divorce

law is the following: The school of Shammai, clinging to Biblical ordinances, says that "a wife can be divorced only on account of infidelity." The school of Hillel says that the husband is not obliged to give a plausible motive for divorce; he may say she spoiled his meal. R. Akiba expresses the same idea in another way; he may say that he has found a more beautiful woman. And those that wish to throw contempt upon the Jewish law add that the school of Hillel, the milder school, is followed in practical decisions. This is one of the cases in which not the whole truth is told. In the first place, a woman has the same right to apply for a divorce without assigning any reason which motives of delicacy may prompt her to withhold. The idea underlying this seeming laxity is that when a man or a woman is willing to apply for a divorce on so trivial a ground then, regard and love having vanished, in the interests of morality a divorce had better be granted after due efforts have been made to effect a reconciliation. In reality, however, divorce laws were far from being lax. The facts that a woman who applied for a divorce lost her dowry, and in almost all cases a man who applied for it had to pay it, would suffice to restrain the tendency. The important points characterizing the Jewish divorce law and distinguishing it far beyond other nations of antiquity are these: A man, as a rule, could not divorce his wife without providing for her; he could not summarily send her from him as was, and is, the custom of eastern countries, but was obliged to give her a duly drawn up bill of divorcement, and women, as well as men, could sue for a divorce.

Regard to the
Finer Sensibil-
ities.

Besides these important provisions regulating woman's estate, there are various intimations in the Talmud of delicate regard paid to the finer sensibilities of women. In a mixed marriage, the child follows the religion of its mother. If men and women present themselves when alms are distributed, the women must be attended to first, so that they need not wait. When men and women had cases before Rabba, he first dispatched those of the women, as it is a humiliation for women to wait. Again, if an orphaned boy and an orphaned girl have to be supported by public charity, the girl is to be helped first, for begging is more painful to a woman than to a man. Under no circumstances could a wife be forced to clothe herself in a way to attract remark or call forth ridicule.

Women are accorded certain privileges in legal proceedings on account of their grace; that is to say, their sex. This is still subtler in the deference it pays to woman's influence. A daughter must remain with her mother. If a man dies, and his sons, his heirs, who are obliged to provide for the daughters out of the inheritance, wish to do so at their own home, while the mother wishes to keep her daughters with her, then the sons are obliged to take care of them at their mother's house. With regard to the education of women, this may be quoted: According to the Mishnah, girls learn the Bible like boys. The religious obligations of women are thus defined. All the duties toward children rest upon the father, not upon the mother. All the duties toward parents rest upon sons and daughters alike. All the

positive commandments which must be observed at a fixed time are obligatory on men and not on women.

These and such are the provisions which, originating in the hoary past, have intrenched the Jewess's position even unto this day. Whatever she may be, she is through them. But what is she? She is the inspirer of a pure, chaste family life, whose hallowing influences are incalculable; she is the center of all spiritual endeavors, the fosterer and confidante of every undertaking. To her the Talmudic sentence applies: "It is a woman alone through whom God's blessings are vouchsafed to a house. She teaches the children, speeds the husband to the place of worship and instruction, welcomes him when he returns, keeps the house godly and pure, and God's blessings rest upon all these things."

Now, finally, with what fitness to meet nineteenth century demands has Judaism endowed her daughters? Our pulses are quickened and throbbing with the new currents of an age of social dissatisfaction and breathless endeavor. The nineteenth century Jewess is wholly free to do as and what she wishes, nor need she abate a jot of her Judaism. Judaism does not, indeed, bid her become a lawyer, a physician, a bookkeeper, or a telegraph operator, nor does it forbid her becoming anything for which her talents and her opportunities fit her. It simply says nothing of her occupations. Moreover, by reason of her Jewish antecedents, the Jewess stands ready to cope with the new requirements of life. Her fitness for moral responsibility has always been great, and as for her mental capacity, it has not oozed away under artificial homage, nor been paralyzed by exclusion from the intellectual work and practical undertakings of her family. Judaism permits her daughters to go forth into this new world of ours to assume new duties and responsibilities and rejoice in its vast opportunities. But it says: "Beware of forfeiting your dignity." Remember, moreover, that, like mothers in all ages, be they kindly or unkindly disposed to women, I shall stand and wait, aye, and be ready to serve you. My Sabbath lamp shall ever be a-light; in its rays you will never fail to find yourself, your dignity, your peace of heart and mind.

Free to Do As
She Wishes



Mosque of Sultan Barkouk.

Religion and the Love of Mankind.

Paper by ex-GOVERNOR J. W. HOYT, of Wyoming.



FTER such an introduction I regret the necessity to say that owing to the great pressure of duties in connection with the exposition, and to the assumption that I should merely for a moment address this body of people, I do not appear before you with any elaborate paper, but with such thoughts only as I have been able to collect during the last one or two days.

Let us thank God that, in this first great parliament of all the religious faiths, a day has been set apart for the study of "religion and the love of mankind." During the last two weeks distinguished representatives of all the great religions of the world have ably, and with a courtesy and spiritual grace that can never be forgotten, presented the cardinal doctrines which serve to identify and distinguish them. The benefit that will come of this friendly association of the great and good of all nationalities, is beyond the power of calculation. Having severally met and heard the representatives of other faiths than our own, and found in them the same high purpose and devotion to the truth of which we are ourselves conscious, our sympathies must have broadened and our hope in the greater future been newly kindled.

Benefits to
Come.

If it should seem that none have yet set forth in the most simple and explicit terms what religion is in the truest and highest sense, it has, nevertheless, become apparent that it is not a mere form of worship, with however rich an adornment of symbol and ceremony; that it is not any particular body of theological dogmas, however interesting historically, intellectually, or ethically. It has surely come to be understood that in a generic way it comprehends all frames of sentiment, all sorts of faith, all forms of worship to which man is moved by his fears, or drawn by his hopes, toward the everywhere apprehended, if not always clearly recognized, sources of infinite power and goodness; and finally that, while its mainspring on the part of man is the love and worship of the Supreme Author and Supporter of all things,

yet in the mind of God the great office of religion is to insure the present and eternal welfare of mankind.

Religion is a fact of man's existence; has its origin not in any conceivable need on the part of God, whose infinity of perfections excludes even the most shadowy thought of the want of any sort, but rather in the finiteness of man, who for this simple reason is none other than a body of wants, both numberless and manifold, and who, because of this conscious insufficiency, is everywhere and always feeling after God. In other words, religion is to be recognized as an outgrowth of the very constitution of man, with his numberless wants of the body so fearfully and wonderfully made; of the Godlike intellect and will so equal to the discovery of natural laws and to a final conquest of the material world; of the undying soul, so capable of unutterable anguish as well as of a joy almost divine. Aye, it is because of this very constitution of man that there has been in all ages, and will be to the end of the world, pressing need of a body of truth, suited to all peoples and times, and embracing such laws as should entitle it to the acceptance and respect of mankind.

Of all this there can be no question. But there is a very serious question of how far the several religions of the world can actually meet these high demands of the race, and how far the vital religious truths found in all of them have been so obscured by the drapery of useless theories and forms as to have been lost sight of and then made of no effect. Is not this a question of profound importance? And where is the religious organization that does not quake when it is propounded?

And there is yet another question of even greater practical moment, namely: Whether religious faiths, thus made conflicting creeds, may not be so harmonized upon the great essential truths recognized by all as to make their adherents cordial allies and earnest co-workers for man's redemption from the bondage of sin and for his advancement to the dignity and glory of the Ideal Man as He was in the mind of God, when He said, "Let us make man in our own image."

The religion that the world needs and will at last have is one that shall make for the rescue and elevation of mankind in every realm and to the highest possible degree—one in which the lofty ideas of the most perfect living here, and of endless progress toward perfection in the great hereafter, shall so engage the powers and aspirations of its votaries as to leave no thought for the profitless theories which at present so absorb and divide the champions of the many faiths. There had been substantial and valuable expressions of it by great and good men long centuries before the Christian era, as by Moses, Confucius, Buddha, Socrates and Mohammed; but in my judgment it had its first full and complete expression in Jesus of Nazareth, who, by His supreme teachings, sounded the depths and swept the heavens of both ethical and religious truth. One searches the literature of all kinds and all peoples in vain for treasures comparable with the Sermon on the Mount. If it were studied and practically accepted of all men how quickly it would revolutionize society everywhere.

The Religion
that the World
Needs.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind; this is the first great commandment and the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Upon these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

How grandly simple this declaration, so comprehensive of all there is that is vital. Who so loveth God with all his heart will seek to know His will and to do that will to the uttermost; nay, will find the supreme joy of life in such living and doing; and through such living and doing will himself be transformed and exalted. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." What meaning there is in this Divine commandment? "As thyself." Here is a theme for many volumes; involving the science of living, the art of living, the high duty of true living, the beauty and dignity and glory of a life consecrated to exalted ends.

Alas, how little there is of loyalty to the self! How few know and obey the laws of the body, and are able to stand erect, sound and strong before the world, fit representatives of the race! How are the multitude but dwarfed, crippled, diseased and comparatively feeble caricatures of the perfect man each ought to be. How small is the minority of those who are loyal to the intellectual self with such culture and development of the mental powers as fit them for man's intended mastery and utilization of the wonderful resources of nature. How sadly small is the minority who are so loyal to the mortal self as to have gained a Christlike comprehension of ethical truth, or even a just conception of the grand possibilities of the moral forces of mankind.

Loyalty to Self.

Finally, can it be doubted, that having this perfect love of God and this true and exalted love of self, man would spontaneously love his neighbor? Nay, does not that love of the Heavenly Father necessarily imply a love of one's fellow since the Fatherhood of God involves the brotherhood of man? What but such a being could have justified the strong language of the great apostle, "He who loveth God loveth his brother, and he who loveth not his brother abideth in death." "For all the law is fulfilled in one word," said the Apostle Paul; "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And in yet stronger language said the loving Apostle John, "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar."


Aye, the brotherhood of man has been a Divine theory of exalted man in all the ages. It is only the Cains of the world who had dared openly to ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In the earlier ages the fraternal sentiment found no higher expression than in the negative comment of the Divine Buddha. "Do not unto others what ye would not have them do unto you." But in the Divine Christ it found affirmative expression in these positive words: "Whatsoever ye would that man should do to you do ye even so unto them."

In this doctrine is founded the fraternities of peoples as well as the brotherhood of individual man. We sometimes forget that the individual man stands for the race and that the law of Christ, "Do unto others whatsoever ye would have them do unto you," is as bind-

Fraternalities
of Peoples.

ing upon peoples, upon the aggregations of men in their relations and intercourse with other peoples as it is upon you or upon me as individuals in the world. How forgetful has been mankind of the sublime truths of the brotherhood of man in all the ages. What have meant the wars in all history? Has not the history of the race been written in blood? Is it not a fact that even religious congregations and the champions of various faiths have drawn the sword and mingled in the strife? Let us thank God for the dawn of a better era—that the time is coming, aye, is at hand, when no nation on earth will dare to draw the sword, or set forth the glistening bayonet without the universal consent of mankind. There is a duty of self-preservation which the individual man and the individual nation must recognize. Aggressive warfare without a submission of one's rights and claims to justice, before a high court of arbitration representing all the nations, let us hope, is at an end. If there were established, and there will be established at an early day, a high court of international arbitration that will lay down the law, that will expound and apply the law, if indeed necessary, to the extent of making the repudiating nation, the nation that shall refuse obedience to that law, an outlaw in the world. With that time shall come the reign of peace for which our truly beloved bishop and these priestly men from many lands have struggled long. I hope this parliament of religion will go forth as an army with Christian banners bearing upon them the high symbols of the cross and all symbols that represent religion and humanity and make peace for all the nations. I believe the day is at hand. Let us join one and all in the devout prayer to Almighty God that it may early come, that all may unite in the grand chorus, "Glory to God in the highest; peace on earth, good will toward all men."





Mosque of Mohamet Aly.

The Grounds of Sympathy and Fraternity Among Religious Men.

Paper by A. M. POWELL, of the Society of Friends, New York.



It is in behalf of one of the smaller religious bodies, the Society of Friends, that I am invited to speak to you. In the time allotted it would be quite impossible to cover exhaustively the whole field of my broad subject, "The Grounds of Sympathy and Fraternity Among Religious Men."

Salvationists
and Quakers.

It is altogether natural and proper that in form and method and ritual there should be diversity, great diversity, among the peoples interested in religion throughout the world; but it is also possible, as it is extremely desirable, that there should be unity and fraternity and co-operation in the promulgation of simple spiritual truth. To illustrate my thought I may say that not very long ago I went to one of the great salvation army meetings in New York with two of my personal friends, who were also members of the Society of Friends. It was one of those meetings full of enthusiasm with volleys innumerable, and we met that gifted and eloquent Queen of the Army, Mrs. Ballington Booth, to whom I had the pleasure of introducing my two Quaker friends. Taking in the humor of the situation, she said: "Yes, we have much in common; you add a little quiet and we add a little noise."

The much in common between these two very different peoples, the noisy Salvationists and the quiet Quakers, is in the application of admitted Christian truth to human needs. It is along that line that my thought must lead this morning with regard to unity and fraternity among religious men and religious women. Every people on the face of the earth has some conception of the Supreme and the Infinite. It is common to all classes, all races, all nationalities, but the Christian ideal, according to my own conception, is the highest and most com-

plete ideal of all. It embraces most fully the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of mankind.

Justice and mercy and love it maintains as due from each to all. There are no races; there are no territorial limitations or exceptions. Even the most untutored have always been found to be amenable to the presentation of this fundamental Christian thought exemplified in a really Christian life. Here I may illustrate by the experience of William Penn among the Indians of North America. He came to them as their brother and as their friend, to exemplify the principles of justice and truth. It is a matter of history that the relations between Penn and the Quakers and the Indians have been exceptional and harmonious on the basis of this ideal brotherhood of man. Alas, that all the Indians in America might not have had representatives of this Quaker humane thought to deal with! What a different page would have been written in American history.

Experience of
William Penn.

Many years later another Friend was sent out under President Grant's administration to labor as a superintendent among the Indians—the noble-hearted, true Quaker, Samuel M. Janney. As he went among the Indians committed to his charge, he not only undertook to deal with them with reference to their material interests, but he also sought to labor among them as their friend, and in a certain sense as a religious helper and teacher. He talked with those Indians in Nebraska about spiritual things. They could understand about the Great Spirit as they listened to him, and he told them furthermore the wonderful story of Jesus of Nazareth, commending His teaching and the lesson of His life and His death to them. They listened, with regard to the Son, as they had, with reverence to the Father, but he could not impress them, in the face of their sad experience with a so-called Christian nature, with the virtues of the Son.

Finally one old chief said to him: "We know about the Father, but the Son has not been along this way yet."

I do not wonder, in the light of the record which this so-called Christian nation had made in dealing with those Indians, that they thought that they had never seen the Son out that way yet. It is, alas, to our shame as a people that it must be said, as a matter of historic truth, that the very reverse of the Christian spirit has been the spirit shown in dealing with the Indians, who have been treated with bad faith and untold cruelty.

A fresh and living instance of this spirit is illustrated in the chapter we are now writing so shamefully in our dealings with the Chinese. We are sending missionaries abroad to China, but what are we teaching by example in America with reference to the Chinese but the Godless doctrine that they have no rights which we are bound to respect? We are receiving lessons valuable and varied, from these distinguished representatives of other religions, but what are we to say in their presence of our shortcomings measured by the standard of our high Christian ideal, which recognizes the brotherhood of all mankind and God as the common Father?

Not a Creed
but a Character.

I want to say that the potential religious life,—and it is a lesson which is being emphasized day by day by this wonderful parliament,—is not a creed but character. It is for this message that the waiting multitude listens. We have many evidences of this. Among the recent deaths on this side of the Atlantic which awakens world-wide echoes of lamentation and regret, there has been no one so missed, and so mourned as a religious teacher in this century as Phillips Brooks. One thing above all else which characterized the ministry of Phillips Brooks was his interpretation, as a spiritual power in the life, of the individual human soul. The one poet who has voiced this thought most widely in our own and in other countries, whose words are to be found in the afterpart of the general programme of this parliament, is the Quaker poet, Whittier. His words are adapted to world-wide use by all who enter into the spirit of Christianity in its utmost simplicity. In seeking the grounds of fraternity and co-operation we must not look in the region of forms and ceremonies and rituals, wherein we may all very properly differ and agree to differ, as we are doing here, but we must seek them especially in the direction of unity and action for the removal of the world's great evils.

I believe we stand today at the dividing of the ways, and whether or not there shall follow this parliament of religions any permanent committee or any general organization, looking to the creation of a universal church, I do hope that one outcome of this great commingling will be some sort of action between the peoples of the different religions looking to the removal of the great evils which stand in the pathway of the progress of all true religions.

Part of my speech has been made this morning by the eloquent ex-governor who preceded me, but I will emphasize his remarks with regard to arbitration. There were two illustrations of my thoughts to which he did not make specific reference. One is recent in the Behring Sea arbitration. What a blessing that is as compared with the old-fashioned method of settling the differences between this country and Great Britain by going to war. We may rejoice and take courage in this fresh illustration of the practicability of arbitration between two great and powerful nations.

I may cite also one other illustration, the Geneva award, which at the time it occurred was perhaps even more remarkable than the more recent arbitration of the Behring Sea dispute. Among the exhibits down yonder at the white city which you doubtless have seen is the great Krupp gun. It is a marvelous piece of inventive ingenuity. It is absolutely appalling in its possibilities for the destruction of humanity. Now, if the religious people of the world, whatever their name or form, will unite in a general league against war and resolve to arbitrate all difficulties, I believe that that great Krupp gun will, if not preserved for some museum, be literally melted and recast into plowshares and pruning hooks.

This parliament has laid very broad foundations. It is presenting an object lesson of immense value. In June I had the privilege of

assisting here in another world's congress wherein were representatives of various nationalities and countries. We had on the platform the distinguished Archbishop of St. Paul, that great liberal Catholic, Archbishop Ireland. Sitting near him was Father Cleary, his neighbor and friend—another noble man. Sitting near those two Catholics was Adjutant Vickery, of the Salvation Army, the representative of Mrs. Ballington Booth, who was unable through sickness to be present. Near these were several members of the Society of Friends, and along with them were some Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians and one Unitarian whose face I see here today. All these were tremendously in earnest to strike a blow at one of the great obstacles to the progress of Christian life in Europe—state regulated vice.

I cannot deal with that subject now, but I may say that it is the most infamous system of slavery of womanhood and girlhood the world has ever seen. It exists in most European countries and it has its champions in America, who have been seeking, by their propaganda, to fasten it upon our large cities. It is one of the most vital questions of this era, and it should be the care and responsibility of religious people everywhere to see that as speedily as possible this great shame shall be wiped away from modern civilization.

State Regu-
lated Vice.

Let me tell you an incident that occurred in Geneva, Switzerland, three or four years ago. There jumped out of a four-story window down to the court below a beautiful young girl. Marvelously, her life was spared. A noble Christian woman, whom I count it a privilege to number among my personal friends, went to this poor girl's side and got her story. In substance it was this:

She had been sold for a price in Berlin to one of the brothel keepers of Geneva and, as his property, had been imprisoned in that brothel, and was held therein as a prisoner and slave. She endured it as long as she could and finally, as she told this friend of mine, "When I thought of God I could endure it no longer and I resolved to take the chances of my life for escape," and she made that fearful leap and providentially her life was spared. What must be the nature of the oppression that will thus drive its victim to the desperate straits of this young girl? It is a slavery worse than the chattelism, in some of its details, which formerly prevailed in our own country.

Now, what has America to do on this line? America has a fearful responsibility. Though it may not have the actual system of state regulation, we call ourselves a Christian country, and yet, in this beloved America of ours, in more than one state, under the operation of the laws called "Age of Consent," a young girl of ten years is held capable of consenting to her own ruin. Shame, indeed; it is a shame; a tenfold shame. I appeal, in passing, for league and unity among religious people for the overthrow of this system in European countries, and the rescue and redemption of our own land from this gigantic evil which threatens us here.

I now pass to another overshadowing evil, the ever pressing drink evil. There was another congress held here in June; it was to deal

with the vice of intemperance. I had the privilege of looking over forty consular reports prepared at the request of the late secretary of state, Mr. Blaine. In every one of these reports intemperance was shown to be a producing cause of a large part of the vice, immorality and crime in those countries. There is need of an alliance on the part of religious people for the removal of this great evil which stands in the pathway of practical Christian progress.

Simplicity in
Religious Life.

Now another thought in a different direction. What the world greatly needs today in all countries is greater simplicity in connection with the religious life and propagandism. The Society of Friends, in whose behalf I appear before you, may fairly claim to have been teachers by example in that direction. We want to banish the spirit of worldliness from every land, which has taken possession of many churches, and inaugurate an era of greater simplicity.

The actual progress of Christianity in accordance with its ideal may be cited, in a sentence, to be measured by the position of women in all lands. The Society of Friends furnished pioneers in the prisons of old England and of New England in the direction of Divinely inspired womanhood. We believe that there is still urgent need of an enlargement of this sphere to woman and we ought to have it preached more widely everywhere. There should be leagues and alliances to help bring about this needed change. The individual stands alone, unaided, comparatively powerless, but in organization there is great power, and in the fullness of the life of the spirit, applied through organization, it is possible to transform the world for its benefit in many directions.

Some one has described salvation as being simply a harmonious relationship between God and man. If that be a true description of the heavenly condition we need not wait till we pass beyond the river to experience something of the uplift of the joy of salvation. Let us band together, religious men and women of all names and nationalities, to bring about this greater harmony between each other and God, the Father of us all. Then, finally, in all lands and in every soul, the lowliest as well as the highest, may this more and more become the joyous refrain of each, "Nearer, My God, to Thee; Nearer to Thee."



Recd. on 8.9.93
B. D. No. 4638
G. R. No. 46557

The Message of Christianity to Other Religions.

Paper by REV. JAMES S. DENNIS, of New York.



CHRISTIANITY must speak in the name of God. To Him it owes its existence, and the deep secret of its dignity and power is that it reveals Him. It would be effrontery for it to speak simply upon its own responsibility, or even in the name of reason. It has no philosophy of evolution to propound. It has a message from God to deliver. It is not itself a philosophy; it is a religion. It is not earth-born; it is God-wrought. It comes not from man, but from God, and is intensely alive with His power, alert with His love, benign with His goodness, radiant with His light, charged with His truth, sent with His message, inspired with His energy, regnant with His wisdom, instinct with the gift of spiritual healing and mighty with supreme authority.

It has a mission among men, whenever or wherever it finds them, which is as sublime as creation, as marvelous as spiritual existence, and as full of mysterious meaning as eternity. It finds its focus, and as well its radiating center, in the personality of its great Revealer and Teacher, to Whom, before His advent, all the fingers of light pointed; and from Whom, since His incarnation, all the brightness of the day has shone. It has a further and supplemental historic basis in the Holy Scriptures, which God has been pleased to give through inspired writers chosen and commissioned by Him.

A Sublime
Mission.

Its message is much more than Judaism; it is infinitely more than the revelation of nature. It has wrought in love, with the touch of regeneration, with the inspiration of prophetic vision, in the mastery of spirit control, and by the transforming power of the divine indwelling, until its own best evidence is what it has done to uplift and purify wherever it has been welcomed among men.

I say welcomed, for Christianity must be received in order to ac-



comply its mission. It is addressed to the reason and to the heart of man, but does no violence to liberty. Its limitations are not in its own nature, but in the freedom which God has planted in man. It is not to be judged, therefore, by what it has achieved in the world except as the world has voluntarily received it. Where it is now known, and where it has been ignored and rejected, it withholds the evidence of its power, but where it has been accepted it does not shrink from the test, but rather triumphs in its achievements. Its attitude toward mankind is marked by gracious urgency, not compulsion; by gentle condescension, not pride; by kindly ministry, not harshness; by faithful warning, not taunting reproaches; by plain instruction, not argument; by gentle and quiet command, not noisy harangue; by limitless promises to faith, not spectacular gifts to sight.

It has a message of supreme import to man, fresh from the heart of God. It records the great spiritual facts of human history; it announces the perils and needs of men; it reveals the mighty resources of redemption; it solves the problems and blesses the discipline of life; it teaches the whole secret of regeneration and hope and moral triumph; it brings to the world the co-operation of divine wisdom in the great struggle with the dark mysteries of misery and suffering. Its message to the world is so full of quickening inspiration, so resplendent with light, so charged with power, so effective in its ministry that its mission can be characterized only by the use of the most majestic symbolism of the natural universe. It is indeed the "sun of righteousness arising with healing in his wings."

We are asked now to consider the message of Christianity to other religions. If it has a message to a sinful world, it must also have a message to other religions which are seeking to minister to the same fallen race and to accomplish in their own way and by diverse methods the very mission God has designed should be Christianity's privilege and high function to discharge.

Let us seek now to catch the spirit of that message and to indicate in brief outline its purport. We must be content simply to give the message; the limits of this paper forbid any attempt to vindicate it, or to demonstrate its historic integrity, its heavenly wisdom, and its excellent glory.

Its spirit is full of simple sincerity, exalted dignity and sweet unselfishness. It aims to impart a blessing, rather than to challenge a comparison. It is not so anxious to vindicate itself as to confer its benefits. It is not so solicitous to secure supreme honor for itself as to win its way to the heart. It does not seek to taunt, to disparage or humiliate a rival, but rather to subdue by love, attract by its own excellence and supplant by virtue of its own incomparable superiority. It is itself incapable of a spirit of rivalry, because of its own indisputable right to reign. It has no use for a sneer, it can dispense with contempt, it carries no weapons of violence, it is not given to argument, it is incapable of trickery or deceit, and it repudiates cant. It relies ever upon its own intrinsic merit and bases all its claims on its right to be heard and honored.

Message of
Supreme Im-
port.

Its miraculous evidence is rather an exception than a rule. It was a sign to help weak faith. It was a concession made in the spirit of condescension. Miracles suggest mercy quite as much as they announce majesty. When we consider the unlimited score of divine power, and the ease with which signs and wonders might have been multiplied in bewildering variety and impressiveness, we are conscious of a rigid conservation of power and a distinct repudiation of the spectacular. The mystery of Christian history is the sparing way in which Christianity has used its resources. It is a tax upon faith, which is often painfully severe, to note the apparent lack of energy and dash and resistless force in the seemingly slow advances of our holy religion.

*Its Miraculous
Evidence.*

Doubtless God had His reasons, but in the meanwhile we cannot but recognize in Christianity a spirit of mysterious reserve, a marvelous patience, of subdued undertone, of purposeful restraint. It does not "cry, nor lift up, nor cause its voice to be heard in the street." Centuries come and go and Christianity touches only portions of the earth, but wherever it touches it transfigures. It seems to despise material adjuncts, and count only those victories worth having which are won through spiritual contact with the individual soul. Its relation to other religions has been characterized by singular reserve, and its progress has been marked by an unostentatious dignity which is in harmony with the majestic attitude of God, its author, to all false gods who have claimed divine honors and sought to usurp the place which was His alone.

We are right, then, in speaking of the spirit of this message as wholly free from the commonplace sentiment of rivalry, entirely above the use of spectacular or meretricious methods, infinitely removed from all mere devices or dramatic effect, wholly free from cant or double facedness, with no anxiety for alliance with worldly power or social eclat, caring more for a place of influence in a humble heart than for a seat of power on a royal throne, wholly intent on claiming the loving allegiance of the soul and securing the moral transformation of character, in order that its own spirit and principles may sway the spiritual life of men.

It speaks, then, to other religions with unqualified frankness and plainness, based upon its own incontrovertible claim to a hearing. It has nothing to conceal, but rather invites to inquiry and investigation. It recognizes promptly and cordially whatever is worthy of respect in other religious systems; it acknowledges the undoubted sincerity of personal conviction and the intense earnestness of moral struggle in the case of many serious souls who, like the Athenians of old, "worship in ignorance;" it warns and persuades and commands, as is its right; it speaks, as Paul did in the presence of cultured heathenism on Mars Hill, of that appointed day in which the world must be judged, and of "that man" by whom it is to be judged; it echoes and re-echoes its invariable and inflexible call to repentance; it requires acceptance of its moral standards; it exacts submission, loyalty, reverence and humility.

Challenges
Admiration.

All this it does with a superb and unwavering tone of quiet insistence. It often presses its claim with argument, appeal and tender urgency, yet in it all and through it all would be recognized a clear, resonant, predominant tone of uncompromising insistence, revealing that supreme personal will which originated Christianity, and in whose name it ever speaks. It delivers its message with an air of untroubled confidence and quiet mastery. There is no anxiety about precedence, no undue care for externals, no possibility of being patronized, no undignified spirit of competition. It speaks, rather, with the consciousness of that simple, natural, incomparable, measureless supremacy which quickly disarms rivalry and in the end challenges the admiration and compels the submission of hearts free from malice and guile.

Its Purport.

This being the spirit of the message, let us inquire as to its purport. There is one immensely preponderating element here which pervades the whole content of the message—it is love for man. Christianity is full of it. This is its supreme meaning to the world—not that love eclipses or shadows every other attribute in God's character, but that it glorifies and more perfectly reveals and interprets the nature of God and the history of His dealings with men. The object of this love must be carefully noted—it is mankind—the race considered as individuals, or as a whole.

Christianity unfolds a message to other religions which emphasizes this heavenly principle. It reveals therein the secret of its power and the unique wonder of its whole redemptive system. "Never man spake like this man," was said of Christ. Never religion spake like this religion, may be said of Christianity. The Christian system is conceived in love; it brings the provision of love to fallen man; it administers its marvelous functions in love; it introduces man into an atmosphere of love; it gives him the inspiration, the joy, the fruition of love; it leads at last into the realm of eternal love. While accomplishing this end, at the same time it convicts of sin, it melts into humility. We who love and revere Christianity believe that it declares the whole counsel of God, and we are content to rest our case on the simple statement of its historic facts, its spiritual teachings and its unrivaled ministry to the world. Christianity is its own best evidence.

I have sought to give the essential outline of this immortal message of Christianity by grouping its leading characteristics in a series of code words, which, when presented in combination, give the distinctive signal of the Christian religion which has waved aloft through sunshine and storm during all the centuries since the New Testament Scriptures were given to man.

Fatherhood.

The initial word which we place in this signal code of Christianity is Fatherhood. This may have a strange sound to some ears, but to the Christian it is full of sweetness and dignity. It simply means that the creative act of God, so far as our human family is concerned, was done in the spirit of fatherly love and goodness. He created us in His likeness, and to express this idea of spiritual resemblance and

He entered the realm of human life through the humble gateway of nature. He came not only to reveal God but to bring Him into contact with human life. He came to assume permanent relations to the race. His brief life among us on earth was for a purpose, and when that was accomplished, still retaining His humanity, He ascended to assume His kingly dominions in the heavens.

Atonement.

We are brought now to another fundamental truth in Christian teaching—the mysterious doctrine of Atonement. Sin is a fact which is indisputable. It is universally recognized and acknowledged. It is its own evidence. It is, moreover, a barrier between man and his God. The divine holiness and sin, with its loathsomeness, its rebellion, its horrid degradation and its hopeless ruin cannot coalesce in any system of moral government. God cannot tolerate sin or temporize with it or make a place for it in His presence. He cannot parley with it; He must punish it. He cannot treat with it; He must try it at the bar. He cannot overlook it; He must overcome it. He cannot give it a moral status; He must visit it with the condemnation it deserves.

Atonement is God's marvelous method of vindicating, once for all, before the universe, His eternal attitude toward sin by the voluntary self-assumption in the spirit of sacrifice, of its penalty. This He does in the person of Jesus Christ, who came as God incarnate upon this sublime mission. The facts of Christ's birth, life, death and resurrection take their place in the realm of veritable history, and the moral value and propitiatory efficacy of His perfect obedience and sacrificial death in a representative capacity become a mysterious element of limitless worth in the process of readjusting the relation of the sinner to his God.

Christ is recognized by God as a substitute. The merit of His obedience and the exalted dignity of His sacrifice are both available to faith. The sinner, humble, penitent and conscious of unworthiness, accepts Christ as his redeemer, his intercessor, his Saviour, and simply believes in Him, trusting in His assurances and promises, based as they are upon his atoning intervention, and receives from God, as the gift of sovereign love, all the benefits of Christ's mediatorial work. This is God's way of reaching the goal of pardon and reconciliation. It is His way of being Himself just and yet accomplishing the justification of the sinner. Here again we have the mystery of love in its most intense form and the mystery of wisdom in its most august exemplification.

This is the heart of the Gospel. It throbs with mysterious love; it pulsates with ineffable throes of divine feeling; it bears a vital relation to the whole scheme of government; it is in its hidden activities beyond the scrutiny of human reason; but it sends the life-blood coursing through history and it gives to Christianity its superb vitality and its undying vigor. It is because Christianity eliminates sin from the problem that its solution is complete and final.

Character.

We pass now to another word which is of vital importance—it is Character. God's own attitude to the sinner being settled, and the

problem of moral government solved, the next matter which presents itself is the personality of the individual man. It must be purified, transformed into the spiritual likeness of Christ, trained for immortality. It must be brought into harmony with the ethical standards of Christ. This Christianity insists upon, and for the accomplishment of this end it is gifted with an influence and impulse, a potency and winsomeness, an inspiration and helpfulness, which is full of spiritual mastery over the soul. Christianity uplifts, transforms, and eventually transfigures the personal character. It is a transcendent school of incomparable ethics. It honors the rugged training of discipline; it uses it freely but tenderly. It accomplishes its purpose by exacting obedience, by teaching submission, by helping to self-control, by insisting upon practical righteousness as a rule of life and by introducing the golden rule as the law of contact and duty between man and man.

In vital connection with character is a word of magnetic impulse and unique glory which gives to Christianity a sublime practical power in history—it is Service. There is a forceful meaning in the double influence of Christianity over the inner life and the outward ministry of its followers. Christ, its founder, glorified service and lifted it in His own experience to the dignity of sacrifice. In the light of Christ's example service becomes an honor, a privilege and a moral triumph; it is consummated and crowned in sacrifice.

Service.

Christianity, receiving its lesson from Christ, subsidizes character in the interest of service. It lays its noblest fruitage of personal gifts and spiritual culture upon the altar of philanthropic sacrifice. It is unworthy of its name if it does not reproduce this spirit of its Master; only by giving itself to benevolent ministry, as Christ gave Himself for the world, can it vindicate its origin. Christianity recognizes no worship which is altogether divorced from work for the weal of others; it indorses no religious professions which are unmindful of the obligations of service; it allows itself to be tested not simply by the purity of its motives, but by the measure of its sacrifices. The crown and goal of its followers is, "Well done, good and faithful servant."


One other word completes the code—it is Fellowship. It is a word which breathes the sweetest hope and sounds the highest destiny of the Christian. It gives the grandest possible meaning to eternity, for it suggests that it is to be passed with God. It illumines and transfigures the present, for it brings God into it and places Him in living touch with our lives and makes Him a helper in our moral struggles, our spiritual aspirations and our heroic though imperfect efforts to live the life of duty. It is solace in trouble, consolation in sorrow, strength in weakness, courage in trial, help in weariness and cheer in loneliness; it becomes an unfailing inspiration when human nature, left to its own resources, would lie down in despair and die. Fellowship with God implies and secures fellowship with each other in a mystical spiritual union of Christ with His people and His people with each other. An invisible society of regenerate souls, which we call the kingdom of God

Fellowship.

among men, is the result. This has its visible product in the organized society of the Christian church, which is the chosen and honored instrument of God for the conservation and propagation of Christianity among men.

This, then, is the message which Christianity signals to other religions as it greets them today: Fatherhood, Brotherhood, Redemption, Incarnation, Atonement, Character, Service, Fellowship.





Prof. Philip Schaff, New York.

The Reunion of Christendom.

Paper by PROF. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., of New York.



THE reunion of Christendom presupposes an original union, which has been marred and obstructed, but never entirely destroyed. The theocracy of the Jewish dispensation continued during the division of the kingdom and during the Babylonian exile. Even in the darkest time, when Elijah thought that Israel was wholly given to idolatry, there were seven thousand—known only to God—who had never bowed their knees to Baal. The Church of Christ has been one from the beginning, and He has pledged to her His unbroken presence "all the days to the end of the world." The one invisible church is the soul which animates the divided visible churches. All true believers are members of the mystical body of Christ.

The saints in heaven and those on earth
But one communion make;
All join in Christ, their living Head,
And of His grace partake.

Let us briefly mention the prominent points of unity which underlie all divisions.

Christians differ in dogmas and theology, but agree in the fundamental articles of faith which are necessary to salvation; they believe in the same Father in heaven, the same Lord and Saviour, and the same Holy Spirit, and can join in every clause of the Apostles' Creed, of the Gloria in Excelsis and the Te Deum.

They are divided in church government and discipline, but all acknowledge and obey Christ as the Head of the church and Chief Shepherd of our souls.

They differ widely in modes of worship, rites and ceremonies, but they worship the same God manifested in Christ, they surround the same throne of grace, they offer from day to day the same petitions which the Lord has taught them, and can sing the same classical hymns, whether written by Catholic or Protestant, Greek or Roman,

Prominent
Points of Unity

Modes of
Worship.

Lutheran or Reformed, Calvinist or Methodist, Episcopalian or Presbyterian, Pædo-Baptist or Baptist. Some of the best hymn writers, such as Toplady and Charles Wesley, were antagonistic in theology; yet their hymns, "Rock of Ages" and "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," are sung with equal fervor by Calvinists and Methodists. Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light" will remain a favorite hymn among Protestants, although the author left the Church of England and became a cardinal of the Church of Rome. "In the Cross of Christ I Glory" and "Nearer, My God, to Thee" were written by devout Unitarians, yet they have an honored place in every trinitarian hymnal.

There is a unity of Christian scholarship of all creeds, which aims at the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. This unity has been strikingly illustrated in the Anglo-American revision of the authorized version of the Scriptures, in which about one hundred British and American scholars—Episcopalians, Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Friends and Unitarians, have harmoniously co-operated for fourteen years (from 1870 to 1884).

It was my privilege to attend almost every meeting of the American revisers in the Bible House at New York, and several meetings of the British revisers in the Jerusalem chamber of Westminster Abbey, and I can testify that, notwithstanding the positive convictions of the scholars of the different communions, no sectarian issue was ever raised, all being bent upon the sole purpose of giving the most faithful idiomatic rendering of the original Hebrew and Greek. The English version, in its new as well as its old form, will continue to be the strongest bond of union among the different sections of English-speaking Christendom, a fact of incalculable importance for private devotion and public worship.

Formerly, exegetical and historical studies were too much controlled by, and made subservient to, apologetic and polemic ends; but now they are more and more carried on without prejudice and with the sole object of ascertaining the meaning of the text and the facts of history upon which creeds must be built.

Finally, we must not overlook the ethical unity of Christendom, which is much stronger than its dogmatic unity and has never been seriously shaken. The Greek, the Latin and the Protestant churches, alike, accept the ten commandments as explained by Christ, or the law of supreme love to God and love to our neighbor, as the sum and substance of the law, and they look up to the teaching and example of our Saviour as the purest and most perfect model for universal imitation.

Before we discuss reunion we should acknowledge the hand of Providence in the present divisions of Christendom. There is a great difference between denominationalism and sectarianism; the first is consistent with church unity as well as military corps are with the unity of an army, or the many monastic orders with the unity of the papacy; the second is nothing but extended selfishness and bigotry. Denominationalism is a blessing; sectarianism is a curse.

We must remember that denominations are most numerous in the most advanced and active nations of the world. A stagnant church is a sterile mother. Dead orthodoxy is as bad as heresy, or even worse. Sects are a sign of life and interest in religion. The most important periods of the church, the Nicene age, and the age of the reformation, were full of controversy. There are divisions in the church which cannot be justified, and there are sects which have fulfilled their mission and ought to cease. But the historic denominations are permanent forces and represent various aspects of the Christian religion which supplement each other.

A Stagnant
Church a Sterile
Mother.

As the life of our Saviour could not be fully exhibited by one gospel, nor His doctrine set forth by one apostle, much less could any one Christian body comprehend and manifest the whole fullness of Christ and the entire extent of His mission to mankind.

Every one of the great divisions of the church has had, and still has, its peculiar mission as to territory, race and nationality, and modes of operation.

The Greek church is especially adapted to the East, to the Greek and Slavonic peoples; the Roman to the Latin races of southern Europe and America; the Protestant to the Teutonic races of the North and West.

Among the Protestant churches, again, some have a special gift for the cultivation of Christian science and literature; others for the practical development of the Christian life; some are most successful among the higher, others among the middle, and still others among the lower classes. None of them could be spared without great detriment to the cause of religion and morality, and without leaving its territory and constituency spiritually destitute. Even an imperfect church is better than no church.

No schism occurs without guilt on one or on both sides. "It must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." Yet God overrules the sins and follies of man for His own glory.

The separation of Paul and Barnabas, in consequence of their "sharp contention" concerning Mark, resulted in the enlargement of missionary labor. If Luther had not burned the pope's bull, or had recanted at Worms, we would not have had a Lutheran church, but be still under the spiritual tyranny of the papacy. If Luther had accepted Zwingli's hand of fellowship at Marburg the Protestant cause would have been stronger at the time, but the full development of the characteristic features of the two principal churches of the reformation would have been prevented or obstructed.

If John Wesley had not ordained Coke we would not have a Methodist Episcopal church, which is the strongest denomination in the United States. If Chalmers and his friends had not seceded from the general assembly of the Kirk of Scotland in 1843, forsaking every comfort for the sake of the whole headship of Christ, we would miss one of the grandest chapters in modern church history.

Sin of Schism. All divisions of Christendom will, in the providence of God, be made subservient to a greater harmony. Where the sin of schism has abounded, the grace of future reunion will much more abound.

Taking this view of the division of the church we must reject the idea of a negative reunion, which would destroy all denominational distinction and thus undo the work of the past.

History is not like "the baseless fabric of a vision" that leaves "not a rack behind." It is the unfolding of God's plan of infinite wisdom and mercy to mankind. He is the chief actor, and rules and overrules the thoughts and deeds of His servants. We are told that our Heavenly Father has numbered the very hairs of our head, and that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without His will. The labors of confessors and martyrs, of missionaries and preachers, of fathers, schoolmen and reformers, and of the countless host of holy men and women of all ranks and conditions who lived for the good of the world, cannot be lost. They constitute a treasure of inestimable value for all the future time.

Variety in unity and unity in variety is the law of God in nature, in history and in His kingdom. Unity without variety is dead uniformity. There is beauty in variety. There is no harmony without many sounds, and a garden incloses all kinds of flowers. God has made no two nations, no two men or women, nor even two trees or two flowers alike. He has endowed every nation, every church, yea, every individual Christian with peculiar gifts and graces. His power, His wisdom and His goodness are reflected in ten thousand forms.

"There are diversities of gifts," says St. Paul, "but the same spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the spirit to profit withal."

Variety in the Church of the Future. We must, therefore, expect the greatest variety in the church of the future. There are good Christians who believe in the ultimate triumph of their own creed, or form of government and worship, but they are all mistaken and indulge in a vain dream. The world will never become wholly Greek, nor wholly Roman, nor wholly Protestant, but it will become wholly Christian, and will include every type and every aspect, every virtue and every grace of Christianity—an endless variety in harmonious unity, Christ being all in all.

Every denomination which holds to Christ the Head will retain its distinctive peculiarity, and lay it on the altar of reunion, but it will cheerfully recognize the excellencies and merits of the other branches of God's kingdom. No sect has the monopoly of truth. The part is not the whole; the body consists of many members, and all are necessary to each other.

Episcopalians will prefer their form of government as the best, but must concede the validity of the non-Episcopal ministry.

Baptists, while holding fast to the primitive mode of immersion must allow pouring or affusion to be legitimate baptism.

Protestants will cease to regard the pope as the anti-Christ predicted by St. Paul and St. John; and will acknowledge him as the legitimate head of the Roman church, while the pope ought to recognize the respective rights and privileges of the Greek patriarchs and evangelical bishops and pastors.

Those who prefer to worship God in the forms of a stated liturgy ought not to deny others the equal right of free prayer as the spirit moves them. Even the silent worship of the Quakers has Scripture authority, for there was "a silence in heaven for the space of half an hour."

Doctrinal differences will be the most difficult to adjust. When two dogmas flatly contradict each other, the one denying what the other asserts, one or the other, or both, must be wrong. Truth excludes error and admits of no compromise.

Doctrinal
Differences.

But truth is many sided and all sided and is reflected in different colors. The creeds of Christendom, as already remarked, agree in the essential articles of faith and their differences refer either to minor points or represent only various aspects of truth and supplement one another.

Calvinists and Arminians are both right, the former in maintaining the sovereignty of God, the latter in maintaining the freedom and moral responsibility of man, but they are both wrong, when they deny one, or the other of these two truths, which are equally important, although we may not be able to reconcile them satisfactorily. The conflicting theories on the Lord's Supper which have caused the bitterest controversies among medieval schoolmen and Protestant reformers turn, after all, only on the mode of Christ's presence, while all admit the essential fact that He is spiritually and really present and partaken of by believers as the Bread of Life from heaven. Even the two chief differences between Romanists and Protestants concerning Scripture and tradition as rules of faith, and concerning faith and good works, as conditions of justification, admit of an adjustment by a better understanding of the nature and relationship of Scripture and tradition, of faith and works. The difference is no greater than that between St. Paul and St. James in their teaching on justification; and yet the epistles of both stand side by side in the same canon of Holy Scripture.

We must remember that the dogmas of the church are earthly vessels for heavenly treasures, or imperfect human definitions of divine truths, and may be proved by better statements with the advance of knowledge. Our theological systems are but dim rays of the sun of truth which illuminates the universe. Truth first, doctrine next, dogma last.

The reunion of the entire Catholic church, Greek and Roman, with the Protestant churches will require such a restatement of all the controverted points by both parties as shall remove misrepresentations, neutralize the anathemas pronounced upon imaginary heresies, and show the way to harmony in a broader, higher, and deeper consciousness in God's truth and God's love.

Controverted
Points.

In the heat of controversy, and in the struggle for supremacy, the



contending parties mutually misrepresented each other's views, put them in the most unfavorable light, and perverted partial truths into unmixed errors. Like hostile armies engaged in battle, they aimed at the destruction of the enemy. Protestants, in their confessions of faith and polemical works, denounced the pope as the "anti-Christ," the papists as "idolaters," the Roman mass as an "accursed idolatry," and the Roman church as "the synagogue of Satan" and "the Babylonian harlot"—all in perfect honesty, on the ground of certain misunderstood passages of St. Paul and St. John, and especially of the mysterious Book of Revelation, whose references to the persecutions of pagan Rome were directly or indirectly applied to papal Rome. Rome answered by bloody persecutions; the Council of Trent closed with a double anathema on all Protestant heretics, and the pope annually repeats the curse in the holy week, when all Christians should humbly and penitently meet around the cross on which the Saviour died for the sins of the whole world.

When these hostile armies, after a long struggle for supremacy without success, shall come together for the settlement of terms of peace, they will be animated by a spirit of conciliation and single devotion to the honor of the great head of the church, who is the divine concord of all human discords.

Traditional
Orthodoxy.

The whole system of traditional orthodoxy, Greek, Latin and Protestant, must progress, or it will be left behind the age and lose its hold on thinking men. The church must keep pace with civilization, adjust herself to the modern conditions of religious and political freedom and accept the established results of Biblical and historical criticism and natural science. God speaks in history and science as well as in the Bible and the church, and He cannot contradict Himself. Truth is sovereign and must and will prevail over all ignorance, error and prejudice.

Church history has undergone of late a great change, partly in consequence of the discovery of lost documents and deeper research, partly on account of the standpoint of the historian and the new spirit in which history is written.

Many documents on which theories and usages were built have been abandoned as untenable even by Roman Catholic scholars. We mention the legend of the literal composition of the Apostles' Creed by the apostles, and of the origin of the creed which was attributed to Athanasius, though it did not appear till four centuries after his death; the fiction of Constantine's donation, the apocryphal letters of pseudo-Ignatius, of pseudo-Clement, of pseudo-Isidorus, and other post-apostolic and medieval falsifications of history, which were universally believed till the time of the reformation, and even down to the eighteenth century.

Genuine history is being rewritten from the standpoint of impartial truth and justice. If facts are found to contravene a cherished theory, all the worse for the theory; for facts are truths, and truth is of God, while theories are of men.

Formerly church history was made a mere appendix to systematic theology, or abused and perverted for polemic purposes. The older historians, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, searched ancient and medieval history for weapons to defeat their opponents and to establish their own exclusive claims. Flacius, the first learned Protestant historian, saw nothing but anti-Christian darkness in the Middle Ages, with the exception of a few scattered "testes veritatis," and described the Roman church from the fifth to the sixteenth century as the great apostasy of prophecy. But modern Protestant historians, following the example of Neander, who is called "the father of church history," regard the Middle Ages as the period of the conversion and the civilization of the barbarians, as a necessary link between ancient and modern Christianity, and as the cradle of the reformation.

Genuine History.

On the other hand, the opposite type of historiography, represented by Cardinal Baronius, traced the papacy to the beginning of the Christian era, maintained its identity through all ages, and denounced the reformers as arch-heretics and the reformation as the foul source of revolution, war and infidelity, and of all the evils of modern society. But the impartial scholars of the Roman Catholic church now admit the necessity of the reformation, the pure and unselfish motives of the reformers, and the beneficial efforts of their labors upon their own church.

A great change of spirit has also taken place among the historians of the different Protestant denominations. The early Lutheran abhorrence of Zwinglianism and Calvinism has disappeared from the best Lutheran manuals of church history. The bitterness between Prelatists and Puritans, Calvinists and Arminians, Baptists and Pædo-Baptists, has given way to a calm and just appreciation.

The impartial historian can find no ideal church in any age. It was a high priest in Aaron's line which crucified the Saviour; a Judas was among the apostles; all sorts of sins among church members are rebuked in the Epistles of the New Testament; there were "many antiChrists" in the age of St. John, and there have been many since, even in the temple of God. Nearly all churches have acted as persecutors when they had a chance, if not by fire and sword, at least by misrepresentation, vituperation and abuse. For these and all other sins they should repent in dust and ashes. One only is pure and spotless, the great head of the church, who redeemed it with His precious blood.

But the historian finds, on the other hand, in every age and in every church, the footprints of Christ, the abundant manifestations of His spirit, and a slow but sure progress toward that ideal church which St. Paul describes as "the fullness of Him who filleth all in all."

The study of church history, like travel in foreign lands, destroys prejudice, enlarges the horizon, liberalizes the mind, and deepens charity. Palestine, by its eloquent ruins, serves as a commentary on the life of Christ, and has not inaptly been called "the Fifth Gospel."

So also the history of the church furnishes the key to unlock the meaning of the church in all its ages and branches.

The study of history, "with malice toward none, but with charity for all," will bring the denominations closer together in an humble recognition of their defects and a grateful praise for the good which the same spirit has wrought in them and through them.

Important changes have also taken place in traditional opinions and practices once deemed pious and orthodox.

The Church
in the Middle
Ages.

The church in the Middle Ages first condemned the philosophy of Aristotle, but at last turned it into a powerful ally in the defense of her doctrines, and so gave to the world the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas and the *Commedia* of Dante, who regarded the great Stagira as a forerunner of Christ, as a philosophical John the Baptist. Luther, likewise, in his wrath against scholastic theology, condemned "the accursed heathen Aristotle," but Melancthon judged differently, and Protestant scholarship has long since settled upon a just estimate.

Gregory VII, Innocent III, and other popes of the Middle Ages claimed and exercised the power, as vicars of Christ, to depose kings, to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, and to lay whole nations under the interdict for the disobedience of an individual. But no pope would presume to do such a thing now, nor would any Catholic king or nation tolerate it for a moment.

The strange mythical notion of the ancient fathers that the Christian redemption was the payment of a debt due to the devil, who had a claim upon men since the fall of Adam, but had forfeited it by the crucifixion, was abandoned after Anselm had published the more rational theory of a vicarious atonement in discharge of a debt due to God.

The un-Christian and horrible doctrine that all unbaptized infants who never committed any actual transgression are damned forever and ever prevailed for centuries under the authority of the great and holy Augustin, but has lost its hold even upon those divines who defend the necessity of water baptism for salvation. Even high Anglicans and strict Calvinists admit that all children dying in infancy are saved.

The equally un-Christian and fearful theory and practice of religious compulsion and persecution by fire and sword, first mildly suggested by the same Augustin and then formulated by the master theologian of the Middle Ages (Thomas Aquinas), who deemed a heretic, or murderer of the soul, more worthy of death than a murderer of the body, has given way at last to the theory and practice of toleration and liberty.

The delusion of witchcraft, which extended even to Puritan New England and has cost almost as many victims as the tribunals of the inquisition, has disappeared from all Christian nations forever.

A few words about the relation of the church to natural and physical science.

Protestants and Catholics alike unanimously rejected the Copernican astronomy as a heresy fatal to the geocentric account of the creation in Genesis, but after a century of opposition, which culminated in the condemnation of Galileo by the Roman inquisition under Urban VIII, they have adopted it without a dissenting voice and "the earth still moves."

Similar concessions will be made to modern geology and biology when they have passed the stage of conjecture and reached an agreement as to facts. The Bible does not determine the age of the earth or man and leaves a large margin for difference of opinion even on purely exegetical grounds. The theory of the evolution of animal life, far from contradicting the fact of creation, presupposes it, for every evolution must have a beginning, and this can only be accounted for by an infinite intelligence and creative will. God's power and wisdom are even more wonderful in the gradual process of evolution.

Concessions
to Geology and
Biology.

The theory of historical development, which corresponds to the theory of physical evolution, and preceded it, was first denounced by orthodox divines (within my own recollection) as a dangerous error leading to infidelity, but is now adopted by every historian, and is indorsed by Christ Himself in the twin parables of the mustard seed and the leaven. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" this is the order of the unfolding of the Christian life, both in the individual and the church. But there is another law of development no less important, which may be called the law of creative headships. Every important intellectual and religious movement begins with a towering personality which cannot be explained from antecedents, but marks a new epoch.

The Bible, we must all acknowledge, is not, and never claimed to be, a guide of chronology, astronomy, geology, or any other science, but solely a book of religion, a rule of faith and practice, a guide to holy living and dying. There is, therefore, no room for a conflict between the Bible and science, faith and reason, authority and freedom, the church and civilization.

Before the reunion of Christendom can be accomplished, we must expect providential events, new pentecosts, new reformations—as great as any that have gone before. The twentieth century has marvelous surprises in store for the church and the world, which may surpass even those of the nineteenth. History now moves with telegraphic speed, and may accomplish the work of years in a single day. The modern inventions of the steamboat, the telegraph, the power of electricity, the progress of science and of international law (which regulates commerce by land and by sea and will in due time make an end of war), link all the civilized nations into one vast brotherhood.

Let us consider some of the moral means by which a similar affiliation and consolidation of the different churches may be hastened:

For the Con-
solidation of
Churches.

The cultivation of an irenic and Evangelical-Catholic spirit in the personal intercourse with our fellow Christians of other denominations. We must meet them on a common rather than on disputed grounds,

and assume that they are as honest and earnest as we in the pursuit of truth. We must make allowance for differences in education and surroundings, which to a large extent account for differences of opinion. Courtesy and kindness conciliate, while suspicion excites irritation and attack. Controversy will never cease, but the golden rule of the most polemic among the apostles, to "speak the truth in love," cannot be too often repeated. Nor should we forget the seraphic description of love, which the same apostle commends above all other gifts and the tongues of men and angels, yea, even above faith and hope.

Co-operation in Christian and philanthropic work draws men together and promotes their mutual confidence and regard. Faith without works is dead. Sentiment and talk without union are idle without actual manifestation in works of charity and philanthropy.

Union of effort in Missionary work.
 Missionary societies should at once come to a definite agreement prohibiting all mutual interference in their efforts to spread the Gospel at home and abroad. Every missionary of the cross should wish and pray for the prosperity of all other missionaries, and lend a helping hand in trouble. What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

It is preposterous, yea, wicked, to trouble the minds of the heathen or of the Roman Catholic with our domestic quarrels, and to plant half a dozen rival churches in small towns where one or two would suffice, thus saving men and means. Unfortunately, the sectarian spirit and mistaken zeal for peculiar views and customs very materially interfere with the success of our vast expenditures and efforts for the conversion of the world.

The study of church history has already been mentioned as an important means of correcting sectarian prejudices and increasing mutual appreciation. The study of symbolic or comparative theology is one of the most important branches of history in this respect, especially in our country, where professors of all the creeds of Christendom meet in daily contact, and should become thoroughly acquainted with one another.

We welcome to the reunion of Christendom all denominations which have followed the Divine Master and have done His work. Let us forgive and forget their many sins and errors and remember only their virtues and merits.

The Greek church is a glorious church, for in her language have come down to us the oracles of God, the Septuagint, the Gospels and Epistles; hers are the early confessors and martyrs, the Christian fathers, bishops, patriarchs and emperors; hers the immortal writings of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius and Chrysostom; hers the Œcumenical councils and the Nicene creed, which can never die.

The Latin church is a glorious church; for she carried the treasures of Christian and classical literature over the gulf of the migration of nations, and preserved order in the chaos of civil wars; she

was the alma mater of the barbarians of Europe; she turned painted savages into civilized beings, and worshipers of idols into worshipers of Christ; she built up the colossal structures of the papal theocracy, the cathedrals and the universities; she produced the profound systems of scholastic and mystic theology; she stimulated and patronized the renaissance, the printing press and the discovery of a new world; she still stands, like an immovable rock, bearing witness to the fundamental truths and facts of our holy religion, and to the catholicity, unity, unbroken continuity, and independence of the church; and she is as zealous as ever in missionary enterprise and self-denying works of Christian charity.

We hail the reformation which redeemed us from the yoke of spiritual despotism, and secured us religious liberty, the most precious of all liberties, and made the Bible in every language a book for all classes and conditions of men.

The Evangelical Lutheran church, the first-born daughter of the reformation, is a glorious church, for she set the word of God above the traditions of men, and bore witness to the comforting truth of justification by faith; she struck the keynote to thousands of sweet hymns in praise of the Redeemer; she is boldly and reverently investigating the problems of faith and philosophy, and is constantly making valuable additions to theological lore.

The Evangelical Reformed church is a glorious church, for she carried reformation from the Alps and lakes of Switzerland "to the end of the West" (to use the words of the Roman Clement about St. Paul); she furnished more martyrs of conscience in France and the Netherlands alone than any other church, even during the first three centuries; she educated heroic races, like the Huguenots, the Dutch, the Puritans, the Covenanters, the Pilgrim Fathers, who by the fear of God were raised above the fear of tyrants, and lived and died for the advancement of civil and religious liberty; she is rich in learning and good works of faith; she keeps pace with all true progress; she grapples with the problems and evils of modern society and she sends the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

Glorious
Churches.

The Episcopal church, of England, the most churchly of the reformed family, is a glorious church, for she gave to the English-speaking world the best version of the Holy Scriptures and the best prayer book; she preserved the order and dignity of the ministry and public worship; she nursed the knowledge and love of antiquity and enriched the treasury of Christian literature, and by the Anglo-Catholic revival under the moral, intellectual and poetic leadership of three shining lights of Oxford—Pusey, Newman and Keble—she infused new life into her institutions and customs and prepared the way for a better understanding between Anglicanism and Romanism.

The Presbyterian church, of Scotland, the most flourishing daughter of Geneva—as John Knox, "who never feared the face of man," was the most faithful disciple of Calvin—is a glorious church, for she turned a barren country into a garden, and raised a poor and semi-barbarous

people to a level with the richest and most intelligent nations; she diffused the knowledge of the Bible and a love of the kirk in the huts of the peasants as well as the palaces of the noblemen; she has always stood up for church order and discipline, for the rights of the laity, and first and last for the crown rights of King Jesus, which are above all earthly crowns, even that of the proudest monarch in whose dominion the sun never sets.

The Congregational church is a glorious church, for she has taught the principle and proved the capacity of congregational independence and self-government based upon a living faith in Christ, without diminishing the effect of voluntary co-operation in the Master's service; and has laid the foundation of New England, with its literary and theological institutions and high social culture.

The Baptist church is a glorious church, for she has borne, and still bears, testimony to the primitive mode of baptism, to the purity of the congregation, to the separation of church and state, and the liberty of conscience; and has given to the world the "Pilgrim's Progress," of Bunyan, such preachers as Robert Hall and Charles H. Spurgeon, and such missionaries as Carey and Judson.

The Methodist church, the church of John Wesley, Charles Wesley and George Whitefield—three of the best and most apostolic Englishmen, abounding in useful labors, the first as a ruler and organizer, the second as a hymnist, the third as an evangelist—is a glorious church, for she produced the greatest religious revival since the day of pentecost; she preaches a free and full salvation to all; she is never afraid to fight the devil and she is hopefully and cheerfully marching on, in both hemispheres, as an army of conquest.

The Society of Friends, though one of the smallest tribes in Israel, is a glorious society, for it has borne witness to the Inner Light which "lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" it has proved the superiority of the Spirit over all forms; it has done noble service in promoting tolerance and liberty, in prison reform, the emancipation of slaves and other works of Christian philanthropy.

Glorious Societies and Brotherhoods.

The Brotherhood of the Moravians, founded by Count Zinzendorf, a true nobleman of nature and of grace, is a glorious brotherhood, for it is the pioneer of heathen missions, and of Christian union among Protestant churches. It was like an oasis in the desert of German rationalism at home, while its missionaries went forth to the lowest savages in distant lands to bring them to Christ. I beheld with wonder and admiration a venerable Moravian couple devoting their lives to the care of hopeless lepers in the vicinity of Jerusalem.

Nor should we forget the services of many who are accounted heretics.

The Waldenses were witnesses of a pure and simple faith in times of superstition, and having outlived many bloody persecutions, are now missionaries among the descendants of their persecutors.

The Anabaptists and Socinians, who were so cruelly treated in the sixteenth century by Protestants and Romanists alike, were the first to

raise their voice for religious liberty and the voluntary principle in religion.

Unitarianism is a serious departure from the trinitarian faith of orthodox Christendom, but it did good service as a protest against tritheism, and against a stiff, narrow and uncharitable orthodoxy. It brought into prominence the human perfection of Christ's character and illustrated the effect of His example in the noble lives and devotional writings of such men as Channing and Martineau. It has also given us some of our purest and sweetest poets, as Emerson, Bryant, Longfellow and Lowell, whom all good men must honor and love for their lofty moral tone.


Universalism may be condemned as a doctrine, but it has a right to protest against a gross materialistic theory of hell with all its Dantesque horrors, and against the once widely spread popular belief that the overwhelming majority of the human race, including countless millions of innocent infants, will forever perish. Nor shall we forget that some of the greatest divines, from Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, down to Bengel and Schleiermacher, believed in, or hoped for, the ultimate return of all rational creatures to the God of love, who created them in His own image and for His own glory.

And coming down to the latest organization of Christian work, which does not claim to be a church, but which is a help to all churches—the Salvation Army—we hail it, in spite of its strange and abnormal methods, as the most effective revival agency since the days of Wesley and Whitefield: for it descends to the lowest depths of degradation and misery, and brings the light and comfort of the Gospel to the slums of our large cities. Let us thank God for the noble men and women, who, under the inspiration of the love of Christ and unmindful of hardship, ridicule and persecution, sacrifice their lives to the rescue of the hopeless outcasts of society. Truly these good Samaritans are an honor to the name of Christ and a benediction to a lost world.

Salvation Ar-
my Effective.

There is room for all these and many other churches and societies in the kingdom of God, whose height and depth and length and breadth, variety and beauty, surpass human comprehension.





Tombs of Queen Taia, 18th Dynasty; King Menephtah, 19th Dynasty, (Exodus);
and Unknown.

The Present Outlook of Religions.

Paper by REV. GEORGE F. PENTECOST, of London, England.



THE center of the world's political power was Rome, as it was the chief seat of the world's religious philosophies. There was the throne of the Cæsars; there the Pantheon with its many gods; and there the famous schools of philosophy. There, also, was a small Christian church—composed of a few believing Jews, a larger number of poor freedmen and slaves, with here and there an "honorable" person and some servants of Cæsar's household—the fame of whose faith had been spread abroad, until Paul, whose habit it was never to build on another man's foundation, came to desire greatly to visit that church and himself gain some fruit also in the world's capital. He had often intended to visit Rome, but had been hindered. So, for the present, he betakes himself to his pen and informs these Christians of his desire and purpose and anticipates his work in person by writing the most massive exposition of the Gospel which the Christian church possesses. This Epistle has been rightly designated the Magna Charta of the Christian faith. It is certainly an unfolding of the doctrines of Christ. It is an Epistle in which alone may be found every fundamental of our faith and practice.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

In visiting Rome, the world's seat of empire, religion and learning, what hope had Paul of gaining a hearing for the Gospel of the Crucified One? What rational hope was there that he could successfully compete with the triple power of Rome and win men and women to Christ by means of the foolishness of preaching Christ and Him crucified?

How could he hope to win even the common people from the age of old religions of the heathen world, which still held the masses in the shackles of superstition; how overcome the aristocratic influence of the philosophers, who still dominated the cultured portion of the empire; and especially how could he hope to exalt into supreme power the Gospel of Christ, under the very throne from whose authority went forth the sentence of death against Christ Himself, at the same

time branding Him as an impostor and traitor? All these things were, no doubt, in Paul's mind, and gave color to this ringing declaration: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Here is sublime faith and courage in what seemed to the world a madman's dream. His reasons for his faith are crowded into this single sentence, in which he contrasts God's power with the powers of the world. Here is a universal good, offered in competition with those philosophies which are kept exclusively for men of wealth, culture, and leisure and which, at best, were cold speculative theories.

In respect of the conquest of the world, or what remains of it among those nations to which the preachers of the Gospel have gone forth, we are occupying much the same standpoint as did Paul. We are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, and are ready to preach it and vindicate it in the face of all the world by every reason which appeals alike to the intellect, heart and the conscience.

The powers of the world do not daunt us; nor are we ashamed to dispute with the wise men and scribes of the schools, nor to contend with the darkest superstition, which enthralls the minds of millions yet unenlightened by the cross of Christ. In this regard it is a great privilege for us Christians to meet face to face in this parliament the representatives of many ancient religions and equally ancient philosophies; to give to them a reason for the faith and hope that is in us, and show them the grounds upon which we base our contention that Christianity is the only possible universal religion, as it is certainly the only complete and God-given revelation.

Liberty and
Freedom.

Happily, there is in this great country no political power to hinder us or make us afraid to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. Demanding absolute liberty for ourselves, we are no less strenuous in our demand that they of other faiths shall enjoy the like freedom.

When Paul declared, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," he meant to say, "There is nothing in the Gospel of Christ which causes me to blush or drop my eyes in the face of any man or of all men. I do not have to apologize for believing the Gospel or preaching it, as if there were anything in it or about it that cannot bear the closest scrutiny from every point of view; either respecting its historical basis of fact, its divine rationality, its ethical system or its power to bestow salvation upon man. The more light that can be brought to bear upon the Gospel the less I am ashamed of it; the more closely it is examined in all its parts the better pleased I will be. I am ready to come to Rome and in the presence of politicians, philosophers and priests of superstition open up and defend the Gospel of Christ." The word translated "ashamed" also bears the meaning of being "disappointed," as in Romans, v, 5.

That is to say, Paul's position is this: "Feeble and foolish as the wise men of this world may deem the Gospel of Christ, great as are the forces, political, religious and philosophical, arrayed against it, I am

not fearful of the final outcome of the conflict of Christianity with the religions and philosophies of paganism, nor, indeed, with the strong arm of the world's political power. The Gospel of Christ is founded upon a rock, and made one with its foundation, so that not even the gates of death shall prevail against it. The power of God is greater than all possible opposing powers. All power has been given into the hands of Jesus Christ, for the propagation and defense of His gospel, and to give eternal life to as many as believe in Him."

Let us now give our attention to the first of these propositions, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ."

We are not ashamed of its antiquity. Some of the religions of the Roman Empire boasted of great antiquity. Indeed, they based their religions on myths whose fancied existence antedated history. This is an easy way to secure antiquity for any faith. There are those among us today, who will tell you that, as compared with their faiths, Christianity is but as the infant of days. The Brahma will tell us that for four thousand years his Aryan ancestors have worshiped the Indian triad on the banks of the Ganges and at Jumna; that the holy city of Benares was the flourishing seat of their faith before Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, and that it has had an unbroken municipality ever since. Peculiarly destitute of the historical sense, millions of years are as easily managed by the orientals as decades are with us. Claiming eternity for their Buddhas and their Puranic heroes, they easily antedate all other faiths by this convenient method.

Not Ashamed.

In our prosaic century, however, these magnificent claims for an antiquity which antedates historic times by millions of years go for nothing.

On the other hand, Christianity is peculiarly buttressed by historic facts. We are often charged by orientals with being the propagators of a modern faith, because, by our own claims, Jesus Christ did not appear until the comparatively recent time of two millenniums ago. The Hindu faith was then already hoary with age. But Christianity does not date from the birth of Christ. Christ crucified two thousand years ago was only the culmination in time, and to our sense, of a revelation already ages old.

Abraham believed in Christ and rejoiced to see His day approaching. Christ was believed on in the wilderness when Moses was bringing his children of Israel out of Egypt; for "the Gospel was preached to them as well as to us." Nay, we need only to read the first simple records of our historic faith to learn that no sooner did man sin and fall from communion in righteousness with God, and ere there was yet a man born unto the world, than God gave to the primeval pair a promise of salvation through Christ. Since that day faith and hope in Christ, "the seed of the woman" who should deliver the world from sin, like two mighty torches have been held aloft by prophet, sage and psalmist, flinging their bright prophetic rays down the vista of the ages until they were gathered up in and flung out again upon the whole world in fullness of glory by the coming of Him who is the True Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

If this statement is deemed to be overdrawn we are prepared to compare the literature of Christianity with that of all other religions, I mean its foundation literature, and trace back, step by step, checking it with historical records of the past, written in books with the pen, graven in the rock, and contained in monumental ruins either above ground or under the mounds of past ages. But we claim no revelation given before the age of our race, and put forth no myth which antedates the history of earth and man. As far back as history goes the records of our faith are found. Every turn of the archæologist's spade confirms the truth of them. In this respect we are not ashamed of the Gospel. Its historical antiquity stands unrivaled among the religions of the world.

We are not ashamed of its prophetic character. This point I have almost anticipated by a remark just now made, yet it is worth while to devote a sentence more to it. Christ's appearance in this world nineteen centuries ago was not an unexpected event. For centuries, even from the beginning of man's spiritual need, He had been looked and longed for, foretold in a hundred predictions, uttered by prophets of many ages and of different types of mind and in many countries; gazed upon in spiritual vision, and sung forth by psalmists of many centuries; His coming is set in symbol and sacrifice, in type and ceremony. An entire nation, whose wonderful people are still scattered among all nations, had its origin, development and marvelous history in the hope of His coming.

Therefore says Paul, "I am a servant of Jesus Christ, separated unto the Gospel of God, which He had afore promised by His holy prophets in the Scriptures, concerning His Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead."

Every detail of His advent was predicted ages before He came; every circumstance and characteristic of His ministry was the subject of prophecy. His resurrection predicted the spread of His Gospel among all nations foretold. In this respect the Gospel stands without a rival upon the face of the world.

The heroes of the world's religions have been either myths or unlooked-for men springing up among their fellows, for whom their disciples neither looked nor were prepared. Who prophesied the coming of Confucius, or Zoroaster, or Krishna, or Buddha? Moreover, none of these heroes or leaders of men were in any sense saviours. They were, at best, teachers, throwing their followers back upon themselves to work out their own salvation as they best might. Jesus stands on an entirely different platform, declaring Himself to be the way, the truth and the life. And so at His birth the angels heralded: "For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour which shall be unto all people."

Christianity is not belief in a doctrine nor primarily a life work, but it consists in a living union with a living Saviour.

If we consult the Bibles of the world's religions we find the same absence of pathetic sequence. There is, indeed, growth of a kind seen in the ancient Scriptures of the Hindus, but no living evolution from pathetic seed to fruitful branch of promises fulfilled. The great truth of Christianity alone appealed to previous promises and prophecies. In every development of fact and doctrine in the Christian religion this is the appeal made, "according to the Scriptures," or "as God had afore promised," or "thus it is written and thus it behooved." Christianity was planted a promise in the soil of human nature so soon as man appeared on the earth, and has grown steadily without check or deviation until this mighty tree of life has spread its branches throughout the world and lifted them high up against the sky. The naturalists tell us that the topmost leaf on the outermost branch of any tree may be traced backward and downward by a living fiber until it finds its beginning in the roots deep under the ground. So it is with the facts and doctrines of Christianity. The tree of life in the paradise of God, as seen in the Revelation, sends its living threads downward through the writings of apostles and prophets until we unearth them in the garden of Eden.

We are not ashamed of the divine author of Christianity. Whether we consider the character of Jehovah-God of the Old Testament, or of the Jesus-God of the New Testament, there is nothing in either that suffers by the highest ethical criticism which may be applied to them. In the Old Testament, from the beginning, God proclaims Himself in love, holiness, righteousness, truth and mercy. One passage out of hundreds will suffice for an illustration of this. When God gave to Moses the tables of stone, on which He had written His law, He "descended in a cloud and stood with him there and proclaimed the name," that is, the character of God. "And the Lord passed before him and proclaimed the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty."

The Divine
Author of
Christianity.

We might well challenge comparison to this passage, in which God reveals His character, from the pages of any religious writing or philosophical speculation extant in the world. As concerning Jesus, the incarnate God of the New Testament—"holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners," "touched with every feeling of our infirmity," and "tempted in all points like as we, yet without sin," the "friend of publicans and sinners" coming into the world to seek and save that which was lost, to call sinners rather than righteous men to repentance—He stands without a peer among men or gods.

The moral glory of His character lifts Him head and shoulders above that of all men or beings, ideal or real, with which we are acquainted. Nineteen centuries of study have only served to increase His glory and confirm and deepen His divine human influence over men; even His worst enemies are among the first to lay at His feet a tribute to His greatness, goodness and glory. He is, indeed, in the

language of a distinguished Hindu gentleman and scholar, uttered in my presence in the old Mahratta city of Poona and before an audience of a thousand of his Brahmanical fellows, "the peerless Christ."

To compare Him to any of the gods worshiped by the Hindus is to mock both them and Him; to compare Him with any of the great religious teachers and philosophers of the world, who, while not claiming for themselves divinity, are put forth by their followers as the highest and brightest examples of human wisdom and character, is only to dazzle their wisdom, dwarf their character, and reveal their thousand and sometimes nameless thoughts in the resplendent brightness of His glory.

Before Jesus came into the world it was the custom of religious men to create an ideal character upon which to model life. No such ideal character ever satisfied the demands of the moral consciousness of the ancient world. Since Jesus came no further attempt has been made to idealize human nature, for one is here whose moral glory shines and glows upon the pages of the Gospels with a brightness and perfection which leaves room only for admiration, wonder and worship.

Highest Model
of Religion.

It is the moral glory of character that has compelled the homage of those even who blindly reject His supernatural origin, compelling flippant Strauss to say: "Jesus represents within the sphere of religion the culminating point, beyond which posterity can never go, yea, which it cannot even equal, He remains the highest model of religion within the reach of our thought and no perfect piety is possible without His presence in the heart."

Renan says: "Whatsoever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will grow young without ceasing. All ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there is none born greater than Jesus." Goethe, the father of the modern school of high culture, in one of his utterances expresses the conviction "that the human mind, no matter how much it may advance in intellectual culture and the extent and depth of the knowledge of nature, will never transcend the high moral culture of Christianity as it shines and glows in the canonical Gospels." Napoleon, the Great, declared: "I search in vain in history to find one equal to Jesus Christ or anything which can approach the Gospel. Neither history, nor humanity, nor the ages, nor nature afford me anything with which I am able to compare or by which to explain it."

These are not the testimonies of devoted but prejudiced disciples of Jesus and Christianity, but the voluntary testimony of men who could do naught else, though they rejected Him as their personal Saviour. Why is it that "rationalism today cannot look at Him closely except on its knees?" Simply because of the infinite perfection and moral glory of His character, which stamps itself upon all His teaching, and without which the demands which He makes upon His disciples to follow Him and to believe unhesitatingly all His words would have long ago been repudiated by the world. There is no such discrepancy

between the teachings of Jesus and the character of Jesus as is generally manifest between the teachings of Hinsua in the Gita and the character of Hinsua as set forth in the Parana.

We are not ashamed of the ethical basis of the Gospel. Without denying that there is to be found ethical teaching of great beauty in the non-Christian religions of the world, it is still true that these religions lay their stress upon their cults rather than upon moral culture. Among most of them there is a striking divorce between religion and morals, if, indeed, these are ever found joined together. But in the Gospel we find that the final test of Christianity is in its power to regenerate and sanctify man.

The moral basis of Christianity may be found throughout the Scriptures; but for the sake of brevity we take only two examples:

The first is that code of righteousness revealed by God to Moses, and which we commonly speak of as the ten commandments. It is strikingly significant that this wonderful moral law was communicated at a period when ethical truth among the then existing nations was at its lowest point and the morals of the people lower than the teaching. Where did Moses get these words? Not from Egypt, nor from the desert where for forty years he lived. They were written by the finger of God and given to him.

God halted the Israelites, to declare to them not only His character, but to lay down for them a law of righteousness in the keeping of which there was life and in the disregard of which there was death. With the exception of the single commandment in respect to the Sabbath day, consecrated to the worship of God, every one of them bears directly on personal morality and righteousness. We need not stop to discuss the unmeasured superiority of these ten words to any code of morals which up to that time the world had ever known. Nor need we do more than remark that, after nearly four thousand years, tested by every intervening age and the most rigid criticism which the advancing moral sense of man (largely developed by the power of this very law), these words still stand unrivaled. Who has ever proposed an amendment either by addition or elimination to this matchless moral code?

Passing from the Old Testament to the New, we have only to call attention to the Sermon on the Mount. These of Jesus spoken to His disciples are but the transfiguration of the ten words given by God to Moses. Jesus declared that He came not to relax or destroy the moral teachings of either the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them. Therefore, in speaking to His disciples He first ratified the ancient code and then expounded it. In the law we see the trunk of a tree, but in the Gospel the Tree of Life from its base upward is unfolded. The Sermon on the Mount digged up its very roots and exposed the hidden life to view. The law deals with actions; the Sermon on the Mount with character. We may be permitted to make the same remark of these wonderful words of Jesus that we did respecting the ten commandments: Who has ever assumed to revise the Sermon on the

Sermon
on the Mount.

Mount in order to eliminate that which is not good or add to it that which it lacked in the way of moral teaching? And may we not ask where can there be found in religious literature a code of morals with which this Sermon on the Mount may be compared? It has been urged against this claim that Jesus was not altogether an original teacher; that some, if not many, of His most beautiful sayings are to be found in the writings of most ancient teachers. Notably, it has been declared that the beautiful maxim of Christ known as the golden rule was borrowed by Jesus from some religious predecessor. But even a casual comparison of the sayings of Christ with those of other teachers will show a vast difference. Truths partially uttered of old, when taken up and stated by our Saviour, are lifted out of the dark and negative surroundings into their positive and unselfish fullness. They are energized and filled with the fullness of His own life, henceforth going forward unfettered to their mission of regenerating the world of fallen humanity. Is it that the truths, or partial truths, spoken by the ancients, dead and powerless for ages, were raised to life and given to the world with all the freshness and power of an original revelation from God in the lips of Jesus? How is it that, while hardly anybody besides the scholar knows of these sayings of the ancient, every child knows and feels the power of the Golden Rule of Jesus? Is it not because one class of maxims contains but partial or half truths, while the sayings of Jesus are the truth and that Jesus embodied them in His own light?

Clear Light
of Midday Re-
velation.

But, beyond the ethical teachings of Christ, which are without question far in advance of all statements which the world had ever had, and which stand today upon the outermost confines of possible statement, Jesus has brought to us a revelation of God Himself, not only as to the fact of His being, but as to His nature and the love and grace of His purpose toward men. Moreover, He has shown in us what we are ourselves, from whence we are fallen, and unto what the purpose of God designs to lift us, together with all the necessary truth concerning human sin; how it is to be put away and man set free from its intolerable guilt and bondage. Besides this, again, the misery of death is unfolded, while life and immortality are brought to light. All these questions have been matters of philosophical inquiry, albeit the inquiry has confessedly been made in the dark. The latest utterances from scientific headquarters have declared that concerning them science is agnostic, without knowledge or the power to know. But Jesus handled these mighty questions with a master's hand and floods them with the clear light of midday revelation.

We are not ashamed of its doctrines or salvation. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. For our present purpose I may mention these following: Incarnation, atonement, regeneration and resurrection. It will be observed that these great doctrines are all inseparably associated with facts and life. In other words, Christianity is a history, a doctrine and a life. History, back of its doctrine, doctrine growing out of its history, and life springing from these. The final test of the truth of the history and the doctrine is the life which results from them. Let me briefly summarize these:

By the incarnation, roughly speaking, we mean that revelation which God made of Himself in Jesus Christ. All natural religions and philosophies show us man seeking after God if happily he may find Him, but here only do we see God seeking after man. The incarnation shows us not only God seeking after man, but identifying Himself with man; not simply acting in grace toward him, but by taking his very nature into union with Himself, and by that union crowning him with glory and honor. Originally made lower than the angels, we see Him in Christ, carried through every stage of existence and seated at last at the right hand of God.

The incarnation shows us what God's thought was in His creation—the broken image of God as seen in man is more than restored in Christ, who is the express image of the Father—the demonstration of God's character and the very brightness of His glory. This not only in respect of the risen and glorified Christ, but of the man Christ Jesus as He lived and moved among men. What shall we say of that matchless life, its purity, its power, and its divine benevolence? Do men scoff at the miracles of mercy wrought by Christ as being fables and inventions of the religious imagination? Do they compare them with the fabulous and mythical stories of the gods and heroes of the orient? When preaching to the educated English gentlemen of India I was often confronted with the statement that "the gods and heroes of India wrought more and greater miracles than Jesus; they, too, fed the multitudes, opened the eyes of the blind, and healed the sick." When I asked for the proof they had none to give except the Puranic stories.

Miracles of
Mercy.

When they in turn challenged me for proof I simply said: "Look around you, even here in India. The reported miracles of your gods and heroes stand only in stories, but each miracle of Christ was a living seed of power and love planted in human nature and has sprung up and flourished again, bringing forth after its kind wherever the Gospel is preached. Who cares for the lepers; who for the sick and the blind, the deaf and the maimed? Till Christ came to India these were left to die without care or help, but now every miracle of Christ is perpetuated in some hospital devoted to the care and cure of those who are in like case with the sufferers whom Christ healed."

This is the difference between the fables of the ancients and the living wonders wrought by the living Christ. He Himself, the embodiment of righteousness, love, pity, tenderness, gentleness, patience and all heavenly helpfulness, being the greatest miracle of all—Jesus among men, as we see Him in the gospels, is God's image restored to us, and through Him acting in grace toward men.

"Sir," said an old gray-haired Brahman to me one day, "I am a Hindu and always shall be, but I cannot help loving Him. The world never knew the like of Him before. When I think of Him I am ashamed of our gods."

In the doctrine of atonement we see the solution of one of the oldest and most stressful questions of the human mind. How God

may still "be just and yet the justifier of the ungodly." How in forgiving transgression, iniquity and sin, He establishes and magnifies the law.

Attitude of
God toward
sinners.

This is the very heart of the Gospel. Here is no doctrine of vengeance exacted by a vindictive God, but the voluntary sacrifice which eternal love makes, to win and bring back to God a lost son, who has by sin come under just condemnation. Here is another statement of the same great doctrine by the same apostle: "But now the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith and His blood; to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, that He might be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." 169573

In connection with this righteousness for us by Jesus Christ there is a righteousness in us by regeneration, wrought by the Holy Ghost, so that every saved man becomes a new creature in Christ. Thus, with righteousness imparted freely by grace and righteousness imparted freely through faith by the holy spirit of God, man stands free from sin and its penalties and is panoplied with a new spiritual nature. He is enabled not only to apprehend an ideal character of holiness, but to attain to such a character through the further sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth. By the Gospel, man, a wanderer and alien from God and an enemy by wicked works, becomes a son filled with the mind of Christ, living and walking in fullest fellowship with God and with man.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead has solved the problem of immortality, not by argument, but by demonstration, and has guaranteed to us a like immortality, not of the soul but of the whole man; spirit, soul and body; for even these bodies of ours, now humiliated and dishonored by sin, and too often yielding themselves instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, shall be changed and fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working of that mighty power that worketh in us by Jesus Christ. Here is a salvation, not only for a surviving spirit, but for the whole man. The body is not a vile encasement of matter essentially gross and sinful, to be gotten rid of, but a temple to be purged of its defilement and become the dwelling place and instrument of the regenerated spirit of man and the permanent tabernacle of God.

In these great central doctrines of the Gospel we have a true knowledge of God, peace for our conscience, new strength for our moral responsibilities and an assured victory over death, by an immortality which reaches beyond the grave into the infinite future, not an absorption into the original God, not an extinction in eternal unconsciousness. This goal is not reached by a series of transmigrations almost endless in extent; but at a bound when the summons comes for



us to depart and be with Christ, which is far better, and in the subsequent resurrection and translation of the body. In the proclamation and defense of these doctrines no matter in presence of what audience, or in debate, whom for antagonists, we are not ashamed of the Gospel.

The unity of God and of the race, and the consequent brotherhood of man, as suggested in Paul's great speech on Mar's Hill, is a statement that causes us to blush of shame, and I may say that it is a teaching unique in Christianity. It is not found in the Hindu Buddhist Bible. The unknown God whom those two superstitious Athenians worshiped is our God, who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from any one of us. Christ, the Son of God and of Man, in His incarnation, joined Himself to the race by a clean dissent from Adam, so that His sálvation has introduced brotherhood in the highest and best sense into the unity of race relationship. A brotherhood real in every respect, making every man equal, before God, with every other man, and placing woman where she belongs, at the man's side, neither slave nor inferior, but companion, wife and helpmate.

While it thus equalizes all men before God it recognizes those necessary and inevitable distinctions which must needs be among men in order to the development and consecration of the human family. In these human relations, all sanctified by the indwelling spirit of Christ, the believer gives due honor to all men, from the station, place and calling wherewith he is called. The master must remember that the servant is also the free man of Christ, and the servant must remember that in the service that he renders to his earthly master he is honoring God. The wife is obedient to her husband, and the husband must reverence and love his wife as his own body. Children must obey their parents in the Lord, and the parent must see to it that he does not provoke his son to wrath by any unjust use of his parental power. The poor must discharge their service to the rich patiently, giving due and honest labor for due and honest wages, and the rich must look to it that they do not keep back the laborer's hire, nor grind the faces of the poor, for God is their avenger and will exact it of them.

Inevitable
Distinctions.

Religion Essentially Characteristic of Humanity.

Paper by REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D., of New York.



O adequately elucidate the meaning of this phrase, which has been given me as my title, and to attempt to demonstrate the truth which it expresses would require a wealth of scholarship which I do not possess and a length of time which it is impossible shall be accorded to any one topic on such an occasion as this. I shall not occupy your time in any words of introduction or peroration, nor shall I attempt the truth of the proposition which I have been asked to speak to. I shall simply endeavor, in a series of statements, to elucidate and interpret, and, in some small measure, apply it.

Religion then—and you will pardon me if I speak in dogmatic phraseology: I am giving you my convictions, and it will be egotistic, as well as needless, for me to interpolate continually “this is what I think”—religion is essential to humanity. It is not a something or a somewhat external to man. It is an essential life of man. It is not a something apart from him which has been imposed upon him by priest or hierarchies here or anywhere. It is not a fungus growth that does not belong to his nature. The power, the baneful power of superstition lies in the very fact that man is religious and that his religious nature, inherent in him, has been too often played upon by evil or ignorant men for base or selfish purposes. But this does not contradict the truth that religion itself is an essential integral part of his own inherent nature. Religion is not a something or a somewhat which has been conferred upon him by any cultus, by any hierarchy, by any set of religious teachers. It has not been handed down from the past to him.

Religion is the mother of all religions, not the child. The white city at yonder end of Chicago is not the parent of architecture; archi-

Religion the
Mother, Not the
Child.



ture is the parent of the white city. And the temples and the priests and the rituals that cover this round globe of ours have not made religion; they have been born of the religion that is inherent in the soul. Religion is not the exceptional gift of exceptional geniuses. It is not what men have sometimes thought poetry or art or music to be, a thing that belongs to a favored few great men. It is the universal characteristic of humanity. It belongs to man as man. Religion is not a somewhat that has been conferred upon him by any supernatural act of irresistible grace, either upon an elect few or an elect many. Still less is it a somewhat that has been conferred upon a few, so that the many, strive never so hard to conform their lives to the light of nature, unless aided by some supernatural or extraordinary acts of grace, can never attain to it. Religion belongs to man and is inherent in man.

Religion In-
herent in Man

If I may be allowed to use the terminology of our own theology, it is not conferred upon man in redemption, it is conferred upon man in creation. It was not first brought into existence at Mount Sinai; it was not first brought into existence at Bethlehem. Christ came not to create religion, but to develop the religion that was already in the human soul. In the beginning God breathed the breath of life into man, and into every man, and all men have something of that divine breath in them. They may stifle it, they may refuse to obey that to which it calls them, but still it is in them. They are children of God whether they know it or know it not. And to their God they are drawn by a power like that which draws the earth to the sun.

Religion, that is, the power of perceiving the Infinite and the Eternal, is a characteristic of man, as man. Man is a wonderful machine. This body of his is, I suppose, the most marvelous mechanism in the world. Man is an animal, linked to the animal race by his instincts, his appetites, his passions, his social nature. He has all that the animal possesses, only in a higher and larger degree; but he is more than a machine; he is more than an animal. He is linked to more than the earth from which he was formed; he is more than the animal from which he was produced; he is linked to the Divine and the Eternal. He has in him a faith, a hope, and love—a faith which, if it does not always see the Infinite, at all events always tries to see the Infinite, groping after Him if happily he may find Him; a hope which, if it be sometimes elusive, nevertheless beckons him on to higher and higher achievements in character and in condition; a love which, beginning in the cradle, binding him to his mother, widens in ever broadening circles as life enlarges, including the children of the home, the villagers, the tribe, the nation, at last reaching out and taking in the whole human race, and in all of this learning that there is a still larger life in which we live and move and have our being, toward which we tend and by which we are fed and are inspired.

Max Müller has defined religion—I quote from memory, but I believe I quote with substantial accuracy—as a perception of such a manifestation of the Infinite as produces an effect upon the moral character and

conduct of man. It is not merely the moral character and conduct: That is ethics. It is not merely a perception of the Infinite: That is theology. It is such a perception of the Infinite as produces an influence on the moral character and conduct of man: That is religion.

Capacity to
Perceive the
Infinite.

My proposition then is this, that in every man there is an inherent capacity so to perceive the Infinite and to every man on this round globe of ours God has so manifested Himself in nature and in inward experience, as that, taking that manifestation on the one hand and a power of perception on the other, the moral character and the conduct of man, if he follows the light that he receives, will be steadily improved and enlarged and enriched in his upward progress to the Infinite and the Eternal. Man is conscious of himself and he is conscious of the world within himself. He is conscious of a perception that brings him in touch with the outer world. He is conscious of reason by which he sees the relation of things. He is conscious of emotions, feelings of hope, of fear, of love. He is conscious of will, of resolve, of purpose. Sometimes painfully conscious of resolves that have been broken. Sometimes gladly conscious of resolves that have been kept. And in all of this life he is conscious of these things; that he is a perceiving, thinking, feeling, willing creature.

He is also conscious of the world outside of himself. A world of form, of color, of material, of phenomena. They are borne in upon him by his perceiving faculties. And he is also conscious of a relation between himself, this thinking, willing creature that he is, and this outward world that impinges upon him. He is conscious that the fragrance of the rose gives him pleasure, and the fragrance of the bone-boiling establishment does not give him pleasure. He is conscious that fire warms him, and he is conscious that fire burns and stings him. He is conscious of hunger; he is conscious of the satisfaction that comes through the feeding of himself when hungry. He is brought into perpetual contact with this outward world, so he becomes conscious of three things:

First, himself; second, the not-self; third, the relation between himself and this not-self. And this relationship is forced upon him by every movement of his life. It begins with the cradle and does not end until the grave. Life is perpetually an impinging upon him. He himself is coerced whether he will or whether he will not, to ascertain what is the relationship, the true, the right, the just, the accurate relationship between this thinking, feeling creature that he calls self and this outward and material and phenomenal world in the midst of which he lives.

In the pursuit of this inquiry he begins by attributing to all the phenomena that impinges upon him the continuous life that is within him. He thinks that all things are themselves persons. He very soon learns from his grouping together of this outward phenomena differently. He groups them in classes, he produces them in provinces, he becomes polytheistic. He goes but a very little way through life before he learns there is a larger unity of life than at first he thought.

He learns that all phenomena of life are bound together in some one common bond. He learns that behind all the phenomena of nature there is a cause; that behind the apparent there is the real, behind the shadow there is the substance, behind the transitory there is the eternal. The old teachers of the old religion, the old teachers of the Japanese religion, they, as well as the old teachers of the Hebrew religion, did see that truth which Herbert Spencer has put in axiomatic form in these later days: "Midst all mysteries by which we are surrounded, nothing is more certain than that we are in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed."

Now he begins to study this energy, for the success of his life, the well being of his life here, even if there were no hereafter, depends on his understanding what are his relations, not only to the related phenomena of life but to the infinite and eternal energy from which all these phenomena spring. And in the study of this energy he very soon discovers that it is an intellectual energy. All the phenomena of life have behind them thought relations. The world has not happened; life is not a chapter of mere accidents; the universe is not a heap of disjecta membra; there is a unity which makes life what it is. It is summed up in the very word by which we endeavor to describe all things, "Uni Verse," all forces combined in one.

All Forces
Combined in
One.

The relation of these phenomena one to the other he seeks to learn. He talks of laws and forces. Science is not merely the gathering of phenomena here and there; science is the discovery of the relations which exist between phenomena and which have existed through eternity. The scientist does not create those relations; he discovers them. He does not make the laws, he finds them. Science is a thought of man trying to find the divine reality that is behind all this transitoriness. Science is the thinking of the thoughts of God after him. He perceives art, the relations of beauty in form, in color, in music. He endeavors to discover what are those relations of beauty in form, in art, in color. He does not create them; he discovers them. They existed before he came upon the stage, and they will continue to exist if by some cataclysm all humanity should be swept off the stage. And in this search for beauty he finds there, too, that he has perceived the infinite. Bach knocks at one door and out there issues one form of music, Mozart another, Mendelssohn another, Beethoven another, Wagner another; each one interprets something of the beauty that lies wrapt up in the possibility of sound, and still the march goes on, still the doors swing open, still the notes come tripping out, still the music grows and grows and grows, and will grow while eternity goes on, for in music we are searching for the infinite and eternal whether we know it or know it not.

Search for
the Beautiful in
Art.

He perceives, however, not only the outward world of things. He perceives an outward world of sentient beings like himself. He sees about him his fellowmen, that they also perceive, that they also reason, that they also hope and fear and love and hate, that they also resolve and break their resolves and keep their resolutions. He sees

Humanity
United Together.

that he is but one of the great company marching along the same highway out of the great unknown in the past toward the same great unknown goal in the future; and he finds, he discerns, that there is a unit in this humanity. First, he sees it in the family, then in the tribes, then in the nations, and last of all in the whole race. If there were no unit in the human race, there could be no history. History is not the mere narration of things that have happened, history is the evolution of the progress of a united race, coming from the egg into the fullfledged bird of the future. There could be no political economy if there were no unit in the human race, no science, no religion, no nothing. We are not a mere set of disintegrated, separate pieces of sand in one great heap which we are building up to be blown asunder. All humanity is united together by unmistakable ties; united with a power that far transcends the local temple, the temple of tribes or nations or creeds or circumstances. And we thus discern that, as there is back of all the material phenomena an ethical culture, so there is back of all moral phenomena moral culture.

History, political economy, sociology, the whole course of the development of the human race is a witness that there is not only an infinite but an eternal energy from which all things proceed, but an infinite and eternal moral energy from which all human life proceeds, and in which all human life in its last analysis has its unifying element. Vital man is compelled to study what this bond of union is. He must know what are the right relationships between himself and his fellow-men. If he fails, all sorts of distresses and calamities come upon him.

He must find out what are the right relationships between employer and employed, what are the right relationships between governor and governed, what are the right relationships between parent and children. Again, he does not make them, but finds out what they are. Let congress, with a power of thirty millions of people behind it, enact slavery in the American constitution; let the thirty millions say, "We will make a law that the blacks shall be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, and the white men shall be served by them," and the law that congress makes, with thirty millions of people behind it, infringes against the divine, eternal and infinite law of human liberty, and it goes down with one great clash and is buried forever.

So man is compelled by the very nature of his social and civil organization to seek for an infinite and eternal behind humanity, an infinite and eternal behind the material and behind the æsthetic. Unconsciously he has been seeking for the divine, but he awaits the consciousness. He knows that there is a divine somewhat, an eternal somewhat, an infinite somewhat, an ideal somewhat, if you like, behind all material and behind all spiritual phenomena, and his emotions are stirred toward that somewhat, stirred to awe, stirred to fear, stirred to reverence, stirred to curiosity, but stirred. So with temple and with worship, and with ritual and with priest, he endeavors consciously to learn who and what this somewhat is who draws him in his moral reso-

lutions to his fellowman, who speaks the inward voice of righteousness in the conscience of the individual.

Thus we get out of religion religions—religions that vary with one another, according as curiosity or fear or hope or the ethical element or the personal reverence predominates. Religious curiosity wants to know about the infinite and eternal, and it gives us creeds and theologies; the religion of fear gives us the sacrificial system, with its atonements and propitiations; the religion of hope expects some reward or recompense from the great Infinite, and expresses itself in services and gifts, with the expectation of rewards here or in some elysium hereafter. Then there is the religion which, although it can never learn the nature of the law-giver, still goes on trying to understand the nature of His laws; and, finally, the religion which more or less clearly sees behind all this that there is One who is the ideal of humanity, the Infinite and Eternal ruler of humanity, and therefore reveres and worships, and last of all learns to love


Religious
Curiosity.

If, in this very brief summary, I have carried you with me, you will see that the object of man's search is not merely religion; he is seeking to know the infinite and the eternal, not merely the priests and the hierarchies, not merely the men and women, with their services, and their rituals, and their prayer-books; but the whole current and tendency of human life is a search for the infinite and the divine. All science, all art, all sociology, all business, all government, as well as all worship, is in the last analysis an endeavor to comprehend the meaning of the great words—honesty, justice, truth, pity, mercy, love. In vain does the atheist or the agnostic try to stop our search to know the infinite and eternal; in vain does he tell us it is a useless quest. Still we press on and must press on. The incentive is in ourselves, and nothing can blot it out of us and still leave us men and women.

Tendency of
Human Life.

God made us out of Himself and God calls us back to Himself. It would be easier to kill the appetite of man and let us feed by merely shoveling in carbon as into a furnace; it would be easier to blot ambition out of man and to consign him to endless and nerveless content; easier to blot love out of man and banish him to live the life of a eunuch in the wilderness than to blot out of the soul of man those desires and aspirations which knit him to the infinite and the eternal, give him love for his fellowmen and reverence for God. In vain does the philosopher of the barnyard say to the egg, "You are made of egg; you always were an egg; you always will be an egg; don't try to be anything but an egg." The chicken pecks and pecks until he breaks the shell and comes out to the sunlight of the world.

We welcome here today, in this most cosmopolitan city of the most cosmopolitan race on the globe, the representatives of all the various forms of religious life, from east to west and north to south. We are glad to welcome them. We are glad to believe that they, as we have been seeking to know something more and better of the Divine from which we issue, of the Divine to which we are returning. We are glad to hear the message they have to bring to us. We are glad to



know what they have to tell us, but what we are gladdest of all about is that we can tell them what we have found in our search, and that we have found the Christ.

I do not stand here as the exponent, the apologist, or the defender of Christianity. In it there have been the blemishes and mars of the human handiwork. It has been too intellectual, too much a religion of creeds. It has been too fearful, too much a religion of sacrifices. It has been too selfishly hopeful; there has been too much a desire of reward here or hereafter. It has been too little a religion of unselfish service and unselfish reverence. No! It is not Christianity that we want to tell our brethren across the sea about; it is the Christ.

Not Christianity but the Christ.

What is it that this universal hunger of the human race seeks? Is it not these things—a better understanding of our moral relations, one to another; a better understanding of what we are and what we mean to be, that we may fashion ourselves according to the idea of the ideal being in our nature; a better appreciation of the Infinite One who is behind all phenomena, material and spiritual? Is it not more health and added strength and clearer light in our upward tendency to our everlasting Father's arms and home? Are not these the things that most we need in the world? We have found the Christ and loved Him and revered Him and accepted Him, for nowhere else, in no other prophet, have we found the moral relations of men better represented than in the Golden Rule, "Do unto others that which you would have others do unto you." We do not think that He furnishes the only ideal that the world has ever had. We recognize the voice of God in all prophets and in all time. But we do think we have found in this Christ, in His patience, in His courage, in His heroism, in His self-sacrifice, in His unbounded mercy and love an ideal that transcends all other ideals written by the pen of poet, painted by the brush of artists, or graven into the life of human history.

We do not think that God has spoken only in Palestine and to the few in that narrow province. We do not think He has been vocal in Christendom and dumb everywhere else. No! We believe that He is a speaking God in all times and in all ages. But we believe no other revelation transcends and none other equals that which He has made to man in the one transcendental human life that was lived eighteen centuries ago in Palestine. And we think we find in Christ one thing that we have not been able to find in any other of the manifestations of the religious life of the world. All religions are the result of man's seeking after God. If what I have portrayed to you this morning so imperfectly has any truth in it, the whole human race seeks to know its eternal and divine Father. The message of the incarnation—that is the glad tidings we have to give to Africa, to Asia, to China, to the isles of the sea.

The everlasting Father is also seeking the children who are seeking Him. He is not an unknown, hiding Himself behind a veil impenetrable. He is not a Being dwelling in the eternal silence; He is a speaking, revealing, incarnate God. He is not an absolute justice, sit-

ting on the throne of the universe and bringing before Him imperfect, sinful man and judging him with the scales of unerring justice. He is a Father coming into human life and coming into one transcendental human life, coming into all human life for all time. Perhaps we have sometimes misrepresented our own faith respecting this Christ. Perhaps, in our metaphysical definitions, we have sometimes been too anxious to be accurate and too little anxious to be true. He Himself has said it—He is a door. We do not stand merely to look at the door for the beauty of the carving upon it. We push the door open and go in. Through that door God enters into human life; through that door humanity enters into the Divine life; man seeking after God, the incarnate God seeking after man; the end in that great future after life's troubled dream shall be o'er, and we shall awake satisfied because we awake in His likeness.

To Awake in
His Likeness.





Rev. E. L. Rexford, D. D., Boston, Mass.

The Religious Intent.

Paper by REV. E. L. REXFORD, D. D., of Boston.



ENERABLE BROTHERS: By the leading of that beneficent providence which has always attended the fortunes of men, we are brought to this most significant hour in the history of religious fellowship, if, indeed, it be not the most significant hour in the history of the religious development of the world. What event in the earlier or the later centuries has ever transcended or even closely approached in its import the meeting of this assembly? What day in all the fragmentary annals of good will ever witnessed a fraternity so manifold or a congress whose constituency was so essentially cosmopolitan? This is a larger Pentecost, in which a greater variety of people than of old are telling in their various language, custom and achievement of the

wonderful works and ways of God. The Emperor Akbar, in overreaching the special limits of his chosen sect that he might pay a fitting tribute to the spirit of religion in its several forms, displayed a noble catholicity of spirit, but, unsupported by the popular sympathies of his age, his generosity was largely personal and resulted in no representative movement.

We have had our national and international evangelical alliances among Christians, and likewise our national and international Young Men's Christian Associations, with assemblies filling the largest halls of Europe and America; but these fellowships have embraced only a slight diversity of opinions and practices in one division of the religious world, while larger numbers of even fellow Christians have been excluded. The portals of the Divine Kingdom have been held but slightly ajar by such untrained Christian hands, while it has been left to the mightier spirit of this day to throw those gates wide open and to bid every sincere worshiper in all the world, of whatever name or

The Parliament a Most Significant Hour in Religious Development.

form, "Welcome in the great and all inclusive name of God, the common Father of all souls."

True Worship.

This is a day and an occasion sacred to the sincere spirit in man, and it is devoutly to be hoped that, out of its generosity and its justice, a new and self-vindicating definition of true and false religion, of true and false worship, may appear. I would that we might all confess that a sincere worship anywhere and everywhere in the world is, a true worship, while an insincere worship anywhere and everywhere is a false worship before God and man. The unwritten but dominant creed of this hour I assume to be, that whatever worshiper in all the world bends before The Best he knows, and walks true to the purest light that shines for him, has access to the highest blessings of heaven; while the false hearted and insincere man, whatever his creed or form may be, has equal access, if not to the flames, then at least the dust and ashes and darkness of hell.

Solidarity of the Race.

I doubt if, at any period very long anterior to this, such an assembly could have been convened. Those great aggregations of the world's interest at Paris and London and Philadelphia had no such feature. Men sought to have the world's activity as completely represented in those expositions as possible, but no man had the courage or the inclination to suggest a scheme so daring as that of a congress of religions. This achievement was left to the closing years of a wonderful century wherein a mightier spirit seems swaying the lives of men to higher issues, at a time when the very Gods seem crowning all the doctrines of the past with the imperial dogma of the solidarity of the race. The time-spirit has largely conquered, though we cannot close our ears entirely to the sullen cry of a baffled and retreating anger, charged with the accusation that the whole import of this congress is that of infidelity to the only divine and infallible religion. Every man is the true believer, himself being the judge, while nobody is the true believer if somebody else is permitted to decide. I am not willing to stand within the limits of my sect or party and from thence judge of the world. I prefer rather to stand in the world as a part of it, and from thence judge of my party or sect, and even of that great religious division of the world's faith and life in which my lot has fallen. There is no separableness in the providence of that infinite Being who is over all and through and in us all.

Primary Fact of the Congress.

The primary fact or condition which justifies this congress in the minds of all reverent and rational men is that, among all sincere worshippers of all ages and lands, the religious intent has always been the same. Briefly, but broadly stated, that intent has been to establish more advantageous relations between the worshiper and the being or beings worshiped. The reverse of this is practically unthinkable. To substitute any other motive would be impossible. This one fact lies at the foundation of every religious structure in the world. Here is the basis of our fellowship. Claude Lorraine once said that the most important thing for a landscape painter to know is where to sit down in order to command a full and fair view of every determining feature in

the landscape. Such a rule must be essential in art, but it is not less imperative in the treatment of that spectacle which religion presents to us in its wide fields, and this observation point of the identity of the religious intent of all the world commands permanent features of every religion in the history of mankind.

Some men stand aloof and scorn and scoff the thought that there is any possible relation between their religion and that of widely diverse types, but this anchor will hold amid all the tempests of religious wrath that may rage. And after these storms of vituperation shall have spent their fury, and editors shall have written leading articles, and archbishops and sultans shall have predicted dire calamities, it will be found that the religious world, as well as the scientific and the commercial, is in the relentless grasp of a divine purpose that will not let the people separate in the deep places of their lives.

Men in the lesser stages of development have been alienated in their religion and by their religion, as if they had been thrust upon this earth from worlds created by hostile gods forever at war with each other and whose children should legitimately fight in the names of their parent deities. If the history of religion in this world could have commenced with the monotheistic conception, the bitter chapters of alienation would have been omitted. But history could not begin on that high level in a world where humanity was destined to work out its own salvation, not only with fear and with trembling but with strife and sorrow and vast misapprehension, from an almost helpless ignorance to the freedom and grace of self-poised and masterful souls.

Alienated in
their Religion.

The infinite wisdom of this universe seems to have decreed that man shall have a great part in the noble task of making himself. A human being fashioned and completed by a foreign power could never be what man has already become by his failures and his successes in the struggle to win the best results of character. A diadem made of the celestial jewels by the combined skill of all the angels in heaven could not compare with that crown which the human being himself shall create by his own heroic and persistent determination to wrest victory from defeat, success from failure—the determination to pluck the truth out of its mysterious disguises, and at last to “think God’s thoughts after Him.”

It has been a difficult problem for the interpreters of man to solve—this fact of frailty and imperfection in the hands of a perfect Deity. Man was created perfect by the perfect God, but he fell from that high, original estate and thus became the poor creature he is.

The distance between the first blind and helpless groping after God with its characteristic griefs, failures and failings and the intelligent comprehension of God and man and religion and duty and the fellowship of today is almost amazing, and yet, in all the tragic though ever brightening way, there is no point where the line of succession breaks off.

God’s working is by development, and we have only to look into

Growth
Religion. of

the magic white city to see that man's work follows the same law and method. Not a single excellence is there that has not had its imperfection that it might be even as perfect as it is. Not a science exists today in all its beautiful adaptations that was not an offensive vulgarism at an earlier day. And religion—shall we say of it that here is a fact in human life that reverses in its movement and method all the human and divine ways with everything else? If there be one pre-eminent fact in the history of religion, that fact is the growth of religion. There is no religion in the world, if it be a living religion, that is today what it was one, two or ten centuries ago. The Christian religion is not today what it was five centuries ago in the thought of the people, and what the religion or anything else is in the actual thought of the people that the thing practically is.

And if this great exposition is wanting in one of the most significant exhibits conceivable, it is a hall that should contain a historic illustration of religion. Max Müller would be one of the few men who could arrange the order of such a hall. And who could visit it without feeling a great uplift of faith and love and joy that we have been what we have and have become what we are? I expect that this suggestion of an evolutionary unity of religion may disturb some classes of men, but you shall see no man in all the retreating centuries performing his devotions with whatever tragic or forbidding accompaniment without saying and being compelled to say: "That man might have been myself, or I might have been as he and should have been had I lived in his country and been educated as he was." It is quite too superficial for us to suppose that this great Spirit bestowed His blessings on the score of the geography and the centuries.

Personal In-
fallibility.

Personal infallibility is not yet attained by any one, inasmuch as personal fortunes are related to the infinite, and that sense of a lingering weakness which must be felt by all men must ally them with the world-wide necessity of a rugged and persistent sympathy. The world has been wounded by fragments of truth, whereas no man can ever be wounded by an entire truth. A detached truth fallen even from heaven would be voiceless, but relate it to the economy of God's purposes and immediately it becomes vocal. It bears in its joyous or its tremulous tones the varying fortunes of every soul that God has made, and it tells the story of the Divine Spirit working in and for all. And if the various and multiplied systems of theology had been written while the theologians were looking in the faces of their human brothers, many a judgment and confusion would have been greatly modified. If one hand had written while the other clasped a human hand the verdict would have been changed. The Word made flesh, or the Divine Spirit set forth in human form and fashion, gleaming out from human faces becomes very tender and very considerate, while the mere theories of men lay no check upon those severities of judgment which have shattered this human world and rent it asunder in the name of religion.

Back to the primal unity, where man appears as a child of God,

before he is a Christian or Jew, Brahman or Buddhist, Mohammedan or Parsee, Confucian, Taoist, or aught beside, back to this must we go if we will be loyal to our kind and loyal to that imperishable religion that is born of human souls in contact with the spirit. Back to this, and thence we must follow the struggle of the Infinite child upward along his perilous ascent through the societies' weary centuries to the ineffable light and glory that await him, led by the patient hand of God.

I am perfectly well aware that this idea of religious unity, and at the base religious identity, must fight its way through the great fields of religious traditions if it will gain recognition — fields preoccupied and bristling with inveterate hostility. It must meet the warlike array of "special providences," and "divine elections," and "sacred books," and "revelations," and "inspirations," and "the chosen people," and "sacraments," and "infallibilities," and institutionalisms of nameless and numberless kinds; but it is not timid, and it has resources of great endurance. Who will say that any man ever sincerely chose any religion for any other than a good purpose? It is incredible. And before the spectacle of an immortal soul seeking for and communing with its God, all hostilities must pause. No missile must be discharged. All the angers and furies must await on that mood and fact of worship; for an immortal soul, talking with God, is greater than a king. And while we wait in this divine silence, let us read the profound and befitting word which heaven has vouchsafed to the people of the Orient, and which has been preserved to us through the ages in one of the "Sacred books of the East." The great deity said to the inquiring Arduna, concerning the many forms of worship: "Whichever form of deity any worshiper desires to worship, with faith, to that form I render his faith steady. Possessed of that faith, he seeks to propitiate the deity in that form, and he obtains from it those beneficial things which he desires, though they are really given by me" (Bhagavad Gita, Chap. vii).

Resources of
Great Endur-
ance.

If we could duly regard the charitable philosophy of such a word the hostilities would never be resumed. No ruthless hand shall justly destroy any form of deity, while yet it arrests the reverent mind and the heart of man. There is only one being in the world who may legitimately destroy an idol, and that being is the one who has worshiped it. He alone can tell when it has ceased to be of service. And assuredly the Great Spirit who works through all forms and who makes all things His ministers can make the rudest image a medium through which He will approach His child.

There is no plea of "revelation" or providence" or "the sacred book" that may not be interpreted in perfect accord with this greater plea of the religious unity of mankind. Nothing is a revelation till its meaning is discovered. God's revelations are made to the world by man's discovery of God's meaning to the world. Revelation by discovery is the eternal law. The "sacred books" of the world, instead of being a revelation from God, are the records of a revelation or the

record of the human understanding of what God has done. Not a truth of life in any or all the holy books was ever written till it had been experienced. Not all the meaning of any great soul in life has ever been set down in words. The divine "Word" was made flesh; it was not made a book. And all the holy books of the world must fall short of that holiest experience of the soul in communion with God.

Bookless Religion.

Max Müller says that what the world needs is a "bookless religion." It is precisely this bookless religion that the world already has, but does not realize it as it should. There is, I repeat, an experience in human souls that lies deeper than the conviction of any book—a religious sense, a holy ecstasy that no book can create or describe. The book does not create the religion; the religion creates the book. We should have religion left if all the books should perish. The eternal emphasis must be placed upon that living spirit that lies back of all Bibles, back of all institutions, and is the eternal reality forever discoverable, but never completely discovered. There is not a piece of mechanism in all this Columbian Exposition that does not owe its defectiveness to a nearer approach to the idea which God concealed in the mechanical laws of the universe. The revelation came through somebody's discovery of it, and the same law holds good from the dust beneath our feet to the star dust of all the heavens, from the trembling of a forest leaf to the trembling ecstasies of the immortal soul.

The "special providences" that pleaded by those who are unwilling to take their places in the common ranks of men, are wholly admissible if it be meant that the specialties are created from the human side. The "divine election" is on the human side, and today it largely means the right of any man to elect himself to the highest offices in the kingdom of God. This is a noble doctrine of election; but, to place the electing mind on the divine side and to say that the common Father elects some and rejects others, forgets some and remembers others in the sense of finality, is to proclaim a Fatherhood little needed on this earth. Because I am a Christian and my brother is a Buddhist is not construed by me as a proof that God loves me better than He does him. I am not willing to be so victimized by love. He is no more cursed by such divine forgetfulness than I am by such capricious remembrance. Let the specialties and let love be one, and our faith remains in their eternal benignity.

And the great religious teachers and founders of the world—have they not secured their immortal places in the love and generation of mankind by teaching the people how to find and use this large beneficence of Heaven? They have not created; they have discovered what existed before. Some have revealed more, others less, but all have revealed some truth of God by helping the world to see. They have asked nothing for themselves as finalities. They have lived and taught and suffered and died and risen again. That they might bring us to themselves? No; but that they might bring earth to God. "God's consciousness," to borrow a noble word from Calcutta, has been the

goal of them all. It is still before all nations. There in the distance—is it so great?—is the mountain of the Lord, rising before us into the serene and the cloudless heavens.

Let all the kingdoms and nations and religions of the world vie with each other in the rapidity of the divine ascent. Let them cast off the burdens and break the chains which retard their progress. Our fellowship will be closer as we approach the radiant summits and there, on the heights, we shall be one in love and one in light, for God the infinite life is there, "of Whom and through Whom and to Whom are all things, and to Whom be the glory forever."

Closer
Fellowship, Fel-



Certainties In Religion.

Paper by JOSEPH COOK, of Boston.



It is no more wonderful that we should live again than that we should live at all. It is less wonderful that we should continue to live than that we have begun to live. And even the most determined and superficial skeptic knows that we have begun. On the faces of this polyglot international audience I seem to see written as I once saw chiseled on the marble above the tomb of the great Emperor Akkabar in the land of the Ganges, the hundred names of God.

Let us beware how we lightly assert that we are glad that those names are one. How many of us are ready for immediate, total, irreversible self-surrender to God as both Saviour and Lord? Only such of us as are thus ready can call ourselves in any deep sense religious. I care not what name you give to God if you mean by Him a spirit omnipresent, eternal, omnipotent, infinite in holiness and every other operation. Who is ready for co-operation with such a God in life and death and beyond death? Only he who is thus ready is religious. William Shakespeare is supposed to have known something of human nature and certainly was not a theological partisan. Now, Shakespeare, you will remember, in "The Tempest," tells you of two characters who conceived for each other supreme affection as soon as they met. "At the first glance they have changed eyes," he says. The truly religious man is one who has "changed eyes" with God under some one or another of His hundred names. It follows from this definition of religion and as a certainty dependent on the unalterable nature of things that only he who has changed eyes with God can look into His face in peace. A religion of delight in God, not merely as Saviour, but as Lord also, is scientifically known to be a necessity to the peace of the soul, whether we call God by this name or the other, whether we speak of Him in the dialect of this or that of the four continents, or this or that of the ten thousand isles of the sea.

Morality and
Religion.

What is the distinction between morality and religion, and how can the latter be shown by the scientific method to be a necessity to

the peace of the soul? And now, though I do not undervalue morality and the philanthropies, I purpose to speak of the strategic certainties of religions from the point of view of comparative religion. First, from the very center of the human heart and in the presence of all the hundred names of God, conscience demands that what ought to be should be chosen by the will, and it demands this universally. Conscience is that faculty within us which tastes intentions. A man does unquestionably know whether he means to be mean, and he inevitably feels mean when he knows that he means to be mean. If we say to that still, small voice we call conscience that proclaims "thou oughtest," "I will not," there is lack of peace in us, and until only we say "I will," and do like to say it, there is no harmony within our souls. The delight in saying "I will" to the still, small voice, "thou oughtest" is religion. Merely calculating, selfish obedience to that still, small voice saves no man.

That Still,
Small Voice

This is the first commandment of absolute science: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind and might and heart and strength." When Shakespeare's two characters met curiosity as to each other's qualities did not constitute the changing of eyes. That mighty capacity which exists in human nature to give forth a supreme affection was not the changing of eyes. Let us not mistake a capacity of religion which every man has for religion itself. We must not only have a capacity to love God, we must have adoration of God, and half the loose, limp, unscientific liberalism of the world mistake mere admiration for adoration. It is narrowness to refuse mental hospitality for any single truth, but we assembled in the name of science, in the name of every grave purpose, have an international breadth and what we purpose to promote is such a self-surrender to God as shall amount to delight in all known duty and make us affectionately and irreversibly choose God under some one of His names—I care not what the name is if you mean by it all the Bible means by the word "God"—choose Him not as Saviour only but as God also, not as Lord only but as Saviour also.

Self-Surrender
to God.

But choice in relation to persons means love. What we choose we love, but conscience reveals a holy person, the author of the moral law, and conscience demands that this law should not only be obeyed but loved, and that the holy person should be not only obeyed but loved. This is the unalterable demand of an unalterable portion of our nature. As personalities, therefore, must keep company with this part of our nature and with its demands while we exist in this world and in the next, the love of God by man is inflexibly required by the very nature of things. Conscience draws an unalterable distinction between loyalty and disloyalty to the ineffable, holy person whom the moral law reveals, and between the obedience of slavishness and that of delight. Only the latter is obedience to conscience.

Love of God
Required.

Religion is the obedience of affectionate gladness. Morality is the obedience of selfish slavishness. Only religion, therefore, and not mere morality, can harmonize the soul with the nature of things. A

delight in obedience is not only a part of religion but is necessary to peace in God's presence. A religion consisting in the obedience of gladness is, therefore, scientifically known to be according to the nature of things. It will not be tomorrow or the day after that these propositions will cease to be scientifically certain. Out of them multitudinous inferences flow as Niagaras from the brink of God's palm. Demosthenes once made the remark that every address should begin with an uncontrovertible proposition. Now it is a certainty, and my topic makes my keynote a word of certainty, that a little while ago we were not in the world and a little while hence we shall be here no longer. Lincoln, Garfield, Seward, Grant, Beecher, Gough, Emerson, Longfellow, Tennyson, Lord Beaconsfield, George Eliot, Carlyle—I know not how many Mahomets—are gone, and we are going. These are certainties that will endure in the four continents and on the isles of the sea.

Till the heavens are old, and the stars are cold,
And the leaves of the judgment book unfold.

Certainty
Founded on
Truth.

The world expects to hear from us this afternoon no drivel, but something fit to be professed face to face with the crackling artillery of the science of our time. I know I am going hence, and I know I wish to go in peace. Now, I hold that it is a certainty, and a certainty founded on truth absolutely self-evident, that there are three things from which I can never escape—my conscience, my God and my record of sin in an irreversible past. How am I to be harmonized with that unescapable environment? Here is Lady Macbeth. See how she rubs her hands:

Out, damned spot! Will these hands ne'er be clean?
All the perfumes of Arabia could not sweeten this little hand.

And her husband in a similar mood says:

This red right hand, it would the multitudinous seas incarnadine, making the green one red.

What religion can wash Lady Macbeth's red right hand? That is a question I propose to the four continents and all the isles of the sea. Unless you can answer that, you have not come here with a serious purpose to a parliament of religions. [Applause.]

I beg you not to applaud, because if there is a topic of more supreme importance than any other it is the topic I am now introducing. I speak now to the branch of those skeptics which are not represented here, and I ask who can wash Lady Macbeth's red right hand, and their silence or their responses are as inefficient as a fishing rod would be to span this vast lake or the Atlantic.

I turn to Mohammedanism. Can you wash our red right hands? I turn to Confucianism and Buddhism. Can you wash our red right hands? So help me God, I mean to ask a question this afternoon that shall go in some hearts across the seas and to the antipodes, and I ask it in the name of what I hold to be absolutely self-evident truths, that

unless a man is washed from the old sin and the guilt of mankind he cannot be at peace in the presence of infinite holiness. [Applause.]

Old and blind Michael Angelo, in the Vatican, used to go to the Torso, so-called—a fragment of the art of antiquity—and he would feel along the marvelous lines, chiseled in bygone ages, and tell his pupils that thus and thus the study should be completed. I turn to every faith on earth, except Christianity, and I find every such faith a torso. I beg pardon; the occasion is too grave for mere courtesy and nothing else. Some of the faiths of the world are marvelous, as far as they go, but if they were completed along the lines of the certainties of the religions themselves, they would go up and up and up to an assertion of the necessity of the new purpose to deliver the soul from a life of sin and of atonement, made of God's grace, to deliver the soul from guilt.

Must Deliver
the Soul from
Guilt.

Take the ideas which have produced the torsos of the earthly faiths and you will have a universal religion, under some of the names of God, and it will be a harmonious outline with Christianity. There is no peace anywhere in the universe for a soul with bad intentions, and there ought not to be. Ours is a transitional age, and we are told we are all sons of God; and so we are, in a natural sense, but not in a moral sense. We are all capable of changing eyes with God, and until we do change eyes with Him it is impossible for us to face Him in peace. No transition in life or death, or beyond death, will ever deliver us from the necessity of good intentions to the peace of the soul, with its environments, nor from exposure to penalty for deliberately bad intentions. I hold that we not only cannot escape from conscience and God and our records of sins, but that it is a certainty, and a strategic certainty, that, except Christianity, there is no religion under heaven or among men that effectively provides for the peace of the soul by its harmonization with this environment.

I am the servant of no clique or clan. For more than a quarter of a century, if you will allow me this personal reference, it has been my fortune to speak from an entirely independent platform, and quite as much at liberty to change my course as the wind its direction; but I maintain with a solemnity which I cannot express too strongly, that it is a certainty, and a strategic certainty, that the soul can have no intelligent peace until it is delivered from the love of sin. It is a certainty, and a strategic certainty, that, except Christianity, there is no religion known under heaven or among men that effectively provides for the soul this joyful deliverance from the love of sin and the guilt of it. It is a certainty, and a strategic certainty, that unless a man be born of water, that is, delivered from the guilt of sin and of the spirit, that is delivered from the love of sin, it is an impossibility in the very nature of things for him to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

No Peace
Without Chris-
tianity.

Except a man be born again he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven; a man cannot serve God and mammon. God cannot deny Himself. Why, these cans and cants are touching the crags of certainty underlying the universe as well as the Scriptures, and it is these crags of absolutely self-evident truth upon which I would plant the

basis of a universal religion, ascertaining the necessity of the new birth for our deliverance from the sin, and of an atonement for our deliverance from the guilt of it. I am not touching the sufficiency of natural religion, but only its efficiency.

I hold that by mere reason we can ascertain the necessity of our deliverance from the guilt of sin, but by mere reason it is difficult to know how we are to be delivered. "Plato," said Aristotle, once a student under a great master, "I see how God may forgive some sins of carelessness, but how He can forgive sins of deliberately bad intention I cannot see, for I do not see how He ought to." [Applause.]

The murderer, the ravisher, the thief have bad intentions, but perhaps, according to their light, those ancients have no more moral turpitude than some bad intentions you and I have cherished. But we must keep peace with our faculties, with this record and with the God who cannot deny Himself. I am afraid of my own faculties. God is in them and behind them. He originated the plan of them. You must stay with yourselves while you continue to exist.

Revelation in
the Argument.

I believe there is good scientific proof of the immortality of the soul if only you bring revelation into the argument; but without revelation and with the Bible shut I hold there is good reason for believing that death does end all. I hold we were woven by some power not in matter, that you may tear up the web and not injure the matter. I make a distinction between the two questions: "Does death end all?" and "Is the soul immortal?" I want every faculty at its best. Shakespeare said: "Conscience is a thousand swords." John Wesley said: "God is a thousand swords." How am I to keep the peace with myself, my God, my record, except by looking on the cross until it is no cross to bear the cross; except by beholding God not merely as my Creator but also as my Saviour, and being melted into the vision and made glad to take Him as Lord also. [Applause.]


I bought a book full of the songs of aggressive evangelical religion and I found in this little book words which may be bitter indeed, when eaten, but which, when fully assimilated, will be sweet as honey. I summarize my whole scheme of religion in these words, which you may put on my tombstone:

Choose I must, and soon must choose
Holiness or heaven lose.
If what heaven loves I hate,
Shut from me is heaven's gate.

Endless sin means endless woe,
Into endless sin I go.
If my soul from reason rent
Taken from sin its final bent.

As the stream its channel grooves,
And within that channel moves,
So does habit's deepest tide
Groove its bed and there abide,





Mosque of Aboubakr—Moorish Sanctuary.

Christianity as Interpreted by Literature.

Paper by REV. THEODORE T. MUNGER, D. D., of New Haven, Conn.



WHEN Christianity appeared in the world it might have been regarded in two ways:—as a force requiring embodiment—something through which it could work; or as a spirit seeking to inform everything with which it should come in contact.

It was both—a force and a spirit, the objective and subjective of one energy whose end was to subdue all things to its own likeness. It was inevitable that Christianity as a conquering energy should lay hold of the strong things in the world and use them for itself. It was inevitable also that as a spirit it should work, spirit-like, from within, secretly penetrating into all things open to it, transforming

them by its mysterious alchemy into forces like itself, drawing under and within itself governments, art, learning, science, literature and whatever else enters into society as shaping and directing energy.

I am to speak of Christianity as interpreted by literature, or, more accurately, upon the way in which Christianity has infused itself into literature and used it for itself, making it a medium by which it conveys itself to the world.

We should never lose sight of the fact that Christianity had its roots in a full and varied literature. It was a literature rich and profound in all departments except philosophy. The Jew was too primitive and simple-minded as a thinker to analyze his thought or his nature; but in history, in ethics, in imaginative fiction and in certain forms of poetry, his literature well endures comparison with any that can be named.

Hebrew Literature.

It is sometimes said that Christ left no book, and that He did not contemplate one; and so men go searching around for the seat of authority, locating it now in an infallible church, and now in Christian consciousness, and now in traditions and institutions; and, not finding any or all of these sufficient, they turn on the bookless Christ, and, as it were in defiance of Him, put together some biographical sketches and sundry epistles, and formally declare them to be the divinely constituted seat of authority.

Christ, indeed, left no book, but He was not, therefore, a bookless Christ. His revelation was not so absolute as to cut Him off from the literature of the past as something upon which He stood, nor from that of the future as something which might embody Him. It is often made an object of study to find Christ in the Old Testament; it were a more profitable study to find the Old Testament in Christ. His first discourse begins with a quotation from it, and He dies with its words upon His lips.

Not a Bookless Christ.

It is not necessary, and it would not be wholly true, to say that the Hebrew scriptures gave shape and direction to Christ. He was too unique, too original, too full of direct inspiration and vision to justify such an assertion; but He stood upon them not as an authoritative guide in religion, but as illustrative of truth, as valuable for their inspiring quality, and as full of signs of more truth and fuller grace. His relation to them, using modern phrases, was literary and critical; He emphasized, He selected and passed over, taking what He liked and leaving what did not suit His purpose. They served to develop His consciousness as the Messiah, but they did not govern or determine that consciousness. We cannot think of Christ apart from this literature. It is not more true to say that it was full of Him than that He was full of it.

Such being the case, we have a right to expect that Christ will go on investing Himself in literature; that Christianity will robe itself in great poems and masterpieces of composition as various at least as those of Judaism, and as much greater as the new faith is greater than the old. As inspiration it demands expression, and the expression will take on the forms of the art it encounters and use it as its medium. But, of itself, inspiration calls for the rhythmic flow and measured cadence, even as the worlds are divinely built upon harmony and move in orbits that "still sing to the young-eyed cherubim."

It was inevitable that a system so full of divine passion should call out a full stream of lyric poetry; that a system involving the mysteries of the universe and great cosmic processes should clothe them in subtle dramas and majestic epics; that a system so profoundly involving the nature of man should produce philosophy; that a religion based on ethics should evoke treatises on human society; that a religion so closely related to daily life should call out the various forms of literature that discuss and depict life.

Enough of Christ's words are recorded to admit of classifying Him in respect to literature. I speak to such as will understand me when I

Christ a Poet.

say that Christ is to be put among the poets—not the singers of rhymes nor the builders of epics, but those who see into the heart of things and feel the breath of the Spirit; such are the poets. It matters not in what form Christ spoke; He was yet a poet. Every sentence will bear the test. Put the microscope over them and see how perfect they are in structure. Lay your ear to them and hear how faultless is their note. Catch their spirit and feel how true they are to the inner meaning of life, how full of God, how keyed to eternity and its eternal hymn of truth and love.

The first literary products of Christianity, apart from those of its founder, were the epistles of St. Paul. It is difficult at present so to separate them from the veneration in which they are held as to look at them in a free and critical way. A prevailing dogma of inspiration shuts us out from both their meaning and their excellence as compositions. They are not treatises, but letters—one mind pouring itself out to others in a most human way for high ends. What freedom, the current flowing here and there, as the mood sways the main purpose, now pressing steadily on between the banks, now overflowing them, going off and coming back, sometimes forgetting to return; careless, but always noble; delicate, but always firm and massive; imaginative, but always natural; original, full of resource, giving off the overflow of his thought and still leaving the fountain full, often prosaic and homely, but as often eloquent and overwhelming in power; a rough, hearty and careless writer; but who ever wrote better or to better purpose?

I hasten to name Dante, "the spokesman of ten silent centuries," as Carlyle called him; the first, if not the greatest, name in Christian literature.

The *Divine Comedy* regarded superficially is medieval, but at the bottom it is of all ages. It has for an apparent motive Order of the Roman Church, but by the very law of inspiration, which may be defined to be that which leads an author unconsciously to transcend his purpose, Dante condemned as a poet what he would have built up as a son of the church. He meant to be constructive; he was revolutionary. By portraying the ideal he revealed the hopelessness of the actual church. He was full of errancy—political, ecclesiastical, theological—all easily separable from the poet and the poem, but at bottom he was thoroughly true and profoundly Christian. He is to be regarded as one called of God to say to his age and to the world what had great need of being said.

Dante's inspiration consists largely in the absoluteness of his ethical and spiritual perceptions, and as such they are essentially Christian. Greek in his formal treatment of penalty, he goes beyond the Greek and is distinctly Christian in his conception of God and of sin. In the purgatory and paradise he enters a world unknown outside of Christian thought. In the Greek tragedies mistake is equivalent to sin and crime, and it led to the same doom; but the *Inferno* (with a few exceptions made in the interest of the church) contains only sinners.

The strong point in Dante is that he ingrafted into literature the purgatorial character of sin; I do not say the dogma of purgatory. Whatever Protestant theology has done with this truth, protestant literature has preserved it, and, next to love, made it the leading factor in its chief imaginative works. Sin and its reaction, pain eating away the sin, purity and wisdom through the suffering of sin, sin and its disclosure through conscience—what else do we find in the great masterpieces of fiction and poetry, not, indeed, with slavish uniformity, but as a dominant thought. Hawthorne wrote of nothing else; it gives eternal freshness to his pages. It runs like a golden thread through the works of George Eliot and makes them other than they seem. The root idea of this conception of sin is humanity—the chief theme of modern literature as it is of Christianity; and it is the one because it is the other. This conception pervades literature because Christianity imparted it.

Sin the Dominant Thought of Fiction.

In Dante it was settled that henceforth Christianity should have literature for a mouthpiece. As the Renaissance and the Reformation prepared the field—one bringing back learning and the other liberty—Christianity began to vest itself in literary forms. We must look for Christianity in literature, not as though listening to one singer after another, but rather to the whole choir. The fifth symphony cannot be rendered by a violin or trumpet, but only by the whole orchestra.

The range is wide and long. It reaches from Dante to Whittier; from Shakespeare to Burns and Browning; from Spencer to Longfellow and Lowell; from Cowper to Shelley and Wordsworth; from Milton to Matthew Arnold; from Bunyan to Hawthorne and Victor Hugo and Tolstoi; from Thomas à Kempis and Pascal to Kant and Jonathan Edwards and Lessing and Schleiermacher and Coleridge and Maurice and Martineau and Robertson and Fairbairns; from Jeremy Taylor and South and Barrow and the Cambridge Platonists to Emerson and Amiel and Carlyle; from Bacon to Lötze; from Addison and Johnson to Goethe and Scott and Thackeray and Dickens and George Eliot.

Christianity is a wide thing, and nothing that is human is alien to it; nor is it possible that any product of a single mind can more than hint at that which comprises the whole order and movement of the world. Christ is more than a Judean slain on Calvary; Christ is humanity as it is evolving under the power and grace of God, and any book touched by the inspiration of this fact belongs to Christian literature. Take the plays of Shakespeare, there is hardly anything in them that is obviously Christian. Still they are Christian, because they are so thoroughly on the side of humanity. How full of freedom; what a sense of man as a responsible agent; what conscience and truth and honor, what charity and mercy and justice; what reverence for man and how well clothed is he in the human virtues, and what a strong, hopeful spirit, despite the agnostic note heard now and then, but amply redeemed and counteracted by the general tenor.

Shakespeare on the Side of Humanity.

Something of the same sort might be said of Goethe. Goethe is

to be regarded as one in whom Christianity won a victory and he rendered it the weightiest service by checking two powerful influences which, however corrective and within limits useful, were pressing unduly upon the faith and even threatening its existence—the infidelity of Voltaire and the naturalism of Rousseau. Goethe set his hard German sense and loftier inspiration against these poisoning and undermining influences, insisting on reverence, and asserting a doctrine of nature that embraced will and spirit and made them the sources of conduct. Goethe also rendered Christianity an inestimable service in destroying the medieval conception of the world as a piece of mechanism and of God as an “external world-Architect”—conceptions that had come in through the Latin theology, or rather had been fostered by it.

Christian
Value of an
Author.

The Christian value of an author is not to be determined by the fullness of his Christian assertion. There is, of course, immense value in the great, positive, full-statured believers like Dante and Bacon and Milton and Browning. But Christianity is all the while in need of two things—correction of its mistakes and perversions, and development in the direction of its universality. None can do these two things so well as those who are partially outsiders. An earnest skeptic is often the best man to find the obscured path of faith.

But if a doubter is often a good teacher and critic of Christianity, much more is it true that it is often developed and carried along its proper lines, not more by those who are within than by those who stand on the boundary and cover both sides. Milton, though a great teacher of Christian ethics in his prose writings, did nothing to enlarge the domain of Christian belief or to better theological thinking in an age when it sadly needed improvement; but Goethe taught Christianity to think scientifically, and prepared the way for it to include modern science. So of Shelley and Matthew Arnold and Emerson and the group of Germans represented by Lessing and Herder, authors who, with their Hellenistic tendencies, represent a phase of thought and life which undoubtedly is to be brought within the infolding scope of Christianity; and no one can do it so well as those modern Greeks.

No one illustrates this point better than Matthew Arnold. He has not a very lovely look with his bishop-baiting and rough handling of dissent. But there is something worthier and broader in the man, as is shown in the fact that the subject of his best sonnet, “East London,” was a dissenting preacher.

Like others of this class of teachers, he calls attention to overborne or undeveloped truth. There is no doubt the church has relied too exclusively upon the miracles; Arnold reminds it that the substance of Christianity does not consist of miracles. It had come to worship the Bible as a fetich, and to fill it with all sorts of magical meanings and forced dogmas, the false and nearly fatal fruit of the reformation. Arnold dealt the superstition a heavy blow that undoubtedly strained the faith of many, but it is with such violence that the kingdom of heaven is brought in. When God lets loose a thinker in the world there is always a good deal of destruction. Such teachers must be

watched while they are listened to. We, ourselves, must be critics when we read a critic.

In tracing our subject historically, it is interesting to note a certain progress or order of development, especially in the poets, in the treatment of Christianity at the hands of literature.

In Chaucer and Shakespeare we have a broad, ethical conception of it, free both from dogma and ecclesiasticism. The former mildly rebuked the evils and follies of the church, but stood for the plain and simple virtues, and gave a picture of a parish minister which no modern conception has superseded. The latter denied nothing, asserted nothing concerning either church or dogma, keeping in the higher region of life, but it was life permeated with the humanity and freedom of Christianity. Milton more than half defeated his magnificent genius by weighting it with a mechanical theology.

The later poets seldom forego their birthright of spiritual vision. Cowper verged in the same direction, but saved himself by the humanity he wove into his verse, a clear and almost new note in the world's music. But the poets who followed him, closing up the last century and covering the first of this, served Christianity chiefly by protesting against the theology in which it was ensnared. The services rendered to the faith by such poets as Burns and Byron and Shelley and William Blake is very great. It is no longer in order to apologize for lines which all wish had not been written. It were more in order to require apology from the theology which called out the satire of Burns, and from the ecclesiasticism that provoked the young Shelley even to atheism; the poet was not the real atheist.

The Later
Poets' Spirit-
ual Vision.

If Christianity is a spirit that seeks to inform everything with which it comes in contact, the process has that clear and growing illustration in the poets of the century. In one way or another—some in negative, but more in positive ways—they have striven to enthrone love in man and for man as the supreme law, and they have found this law in God, who works in righteousness for its fulfillment. The roll might be called from Wordsworth and Coleridge down to Whittier, and but few would need to be counted out.

The marked examples are Tennyson and Browning, and of the two I think Tennyson is the clearer. Speaking roughly, and taking his work as a whole, I regard it as more thoroughly informed with Christianity than that of any other master in literature. I do not forget the overwhelming positiveness of Browning, whose faith is the very evidence of things unseen and whose hope is like a contagion. It is this very positiveness that removes him a little way from us; it is high and we cannot quite attain to it. Tennyson, on the contrary, speaks on the level of our finite hearts, believes and doubts with us, debates the problems of faith with us, and such victories as he wins are also ours. Browning leaves us behind as he storms his way into the heaven of his unclouded hope, but Tennyson stays with us in a world which, being such as it is, is never without a shadow. The more clearly we see the eternal the more deeply are we enshrouded in the finite,

Tennyson and
Browning as
Examples.

The most interesting fact in connection with our subject is the thorough discussion Christianity is now undergoing in literature, and Tennyson is the undoubted leader in the debate. It is not only in the highest form of literary art, but it is based on the latest and fullest science. He turns evolution into faith and makes it the ground of hope.

It is not in the "In Memoriam," however, but in the *Idyls* that we have his fullest explication of Christianity. These *Idyls* are sermons or treatises; they deal with all sins, faults, graces, virtues, character in all its phases and forms and processes put under a conception of Christ which nineteen centuries have evolved plus the insight of the poet.

Real Defenders of the Faith.

The value of these restatements of Christianity, especially by the poets, is beyond estimate. They are the real defenders of the faith, the prophets and priests, whose succession never fails. Leslie Stephen writes an enticing plea for agnosticism, and seems to sweep the universe clean of faith and God; we read Tennyson's "Higher Pantheism," "The Two Voices," "In Memoriam," or Browning's "Saul," "Death in the Desert," or Wordsworth's odes on Immortality and Duty, or Whittier's "My Psalm," and the plea for agnosticism fades out. In some way it seems truer and better to believe.

Such prophets never cease, though their coming is uncertain. In the years just gone three have "lost themselves in the light" they saw so clearly, and the succession will not fail. So long as a century can produce such interpreters of Christianity as Tennyson and Browning and Whittier, it will not vanish from the earth.

It will be seen that I have simply touched a few points of a subject too large and widespread to be brought within an hour's space. To amend for so scanty treatment, I will briefly enumerate the chief ways in which literature becomes the interpreter of Christianity.

Ways in which Literature Interprets Christianity.

Literature interprets Christianity correctly for the plain reason that both are keyed to the spirit. The inspiration of high literature is that of truth; it reveals the nature and meaning of things, which is the office of the spirit that takes the things of Christ and shows them unto us even as the poet interprets life—two similar and sympathetic processes.

Literature, with few exceptions—all inspired literature—stands squarely upon humanity and insists upon it on ethical grounds and for ethical ends, and this is essential Christianity.

Literature in its highest forms is unworldly. It is a protest against the worldly temper, the worldly motive, the worldly habit. It appeals to the spiritual and the invisible; it readily allies itself with all the greater Christian truths and hopes and becomes their mouthpiece.

The greater literature is prophetic and optimistic. Its keynote is, "All is well," and it accords with the Christian secret, "Behold, I make all things new."

Literature, in its higher ranges, is the correction of poor thinking—that which is crude, extravagant, superstitious, hard, one-sided. This is especially true in the realm of theological thought.

The theology of the west, with the western passion for clearness and immediate effectiveness, is mechanical and prosaic; it pleases the ordinary mind, and therefore a democratic age insists on it; it is a good tool for priestcraft; it is easily defended by formal logic, but it does not satisfy the thinker and it is abhorrent to the poet. Hence, thoroughly as it has swayed the occidental world, it has never commanded the assent of the choicest occidental minds. Hence the long line of mystics, through whom lies the true continuity of Christian theology, always verging upon poetry and often reaching it. A theology that insists on a transcendent God, who sits above the world and spins the thread of its affairs as a spinner at a wheel, that holds to such a conception of God because it involves the simplest of several perplexing propositions; that resents immanence as involving pantheism; that makes two catalogues--the natural and the supernatural--and puts everything it can understand into one list and everything it cannot understand into the other, and then makes faith turn upon accepting this division, such a theology does not command the assent of those minds who express themselves in literature; the poet, the man of genius, the broad and universal thinker pass it by; they stand too near God to be deceived by such renderings of His truth. All the while, in every age, these children of light have made their protest, and it is through them that the chief gains in theological thought have been secured.

Theology of
the West.

For the most part, the greater names in literature have been true to Christ, and it is the Christ in them that has corrected theology, redeeming it from dogmatism and making it capable of belief, not clear, perhaps, but profound.

Study of the Sacred Books of the World as Literature.

Paper by PROF. MILTON S. TERRY, D. D., of Evanston, Ill.



HERE have been and probably yet exist some isolated tribes of men who imagine that the sun rises and sets for their sole benefit. They occupy, perchance, a lonely island far from the routes of ocean travel, and have no thought that the sounding waters about their island homes are at the same time washing beautiful corals and precious pearls on other shores. We say: How circumscribed their vision; how narrow their world! But the same may be said of anyone who is so circumscribed by the conditions of race and language in which he has been reared that he has no knowledge or appreciation of lands, nations, religions and literatures which differ from

his own. I am a Christian, and must needs look at things from a Christian point of view. But that fact should not hinder the broadest observation. Christian scholars have for centuries admired the poems of Homer and will never lose interest in the story of Odysseus, the myriad-minded Greek, who traversed the roaring seas, touched many a foreign shore and observed the habitations and customs of many men. Will they be likely to discard the recently deciphered Accadian hymns and Assyrian penitential psalms? Is it probable that men who can devote studious years to the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle will care nothing about the invocations of the old Persian Avesta, the Vedic hymns, the doctrines of Buddha and the maxims of Confucius? Nay, I repeat it, I am a Christian; therefore, I think there is nothing human or divine in any literature of the world that I can afford to ignore. My own New Testament scriptures enjoin the following words as a solemn commandment:

"Whatever things are true, whatever things are worthy of honor, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are

Looked at
from a Christ-
ian Standpoint.



Prof. Milton S. Terry, D. D., Evanston, Ill.

lovely, whatever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise exercise reason upon these things" (Phil. iv, 8).

My task is to speak of the "sacred books of the world" as so much various literature. And I must at the very outset acknowledge my inability to treat such a broad subject with anything like comprehensive thoroughness. And had I the requisite knowledge and ability, the time at my disposal would forbid. I can only glance at some notable characteristics of this varied literature, and call attention to some few things which are worthy of protracted study.

I commence with a quotation from the treatise of the old Chinese philosopher Lao Tsze, where he gives utterance to his conception of the Infinite. He seems to be struggling in thought with the great power which is back of all phenomena, and seeking to set forth the idea which possesses him so that others may grasp it. His book is known as the Tao-teh-king, and is devoted to the praise of what the author calls his Tao. The twenty-fifth chapter, as translated by John Chalmers, reads thus:

Power Back
of all Phenom-
ena.


"There was something chaotic in nature which existed before heaven and earth. It was still. It was void. It stood alone and was not changed. It pervaded everywhere and was not endangered. It may be regarded as the mother of the universe. I know not its name, but give it the title of Tao. If I am forced to make a name for it I say it is Great; being great, I say that it passes away; passing away, I say that it is far off; being far off, I say that it returns. Now, Tao is great, heaven is great, earth is great, a king is great. In the universe there are four greatnesses and a king is one of them. Man takes his law from the earth; the earth takes its law from heaven; heaven takes its law from Tao, and Tao takes its law from what it is in itself."

"Now it is not the theology of this passage nor its cosmology that we put forward, but rather its grand poetic concepts. Here is the production of an ancient sage, born six hundred years before the Christian era. He had no Pentateuch or Hexateuch to enlighten him; no Isaiah to prophesy to him; no Vedic songs addressed to the deities of earth and sea and air; no pilgrim from any other nation to tell him of the thoughts and things of other lands. But like a poet reared under other skies, he felt"

Production
from an An-
cient Sage.

"A presence that disturbed him with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man—
A motion of a spirit that impels
All thinking things."

Students of Lao Tsze's book have tried to express his idea of Tao by other terms. It has been called the Supreme Reason, the Universal Soul, the Eternal Idea, the Nameless Void, Mother of Being and Essence of Things. But the very mystery that attaches to the word becomes an element of power in the literary features of the book.



That suggestiveness of something great and yet intangible, a something that awes and impresses and yet eludes our grasp, is recognized by all great writers and critics as a conspicuous element in the masterpieces of literature.

I have purposely chosen this passage from the old Chinese book since it affords a subject for comparison in other sacred books. Most religions have some theory or poem of creation, and I select next the famous hymn of Creation from the Rigveda (Bk. 10, ch. 129). It is not by any means the most beautiful specimen of the Vedic hymns, but it shows how an ancient Indian poet thought and spoke of the mysterious origin of things. He looked out on a mist-wrapt ocean of being, and his soul was filled with strong desire to know its secrets.

"Then there was nothing being nor not-being;
The atmosphere was not, nor sky above it.
What covered all? And where? By what protected?
Was there the fathomless abyss of waters?

When neither death nor deathlessness existed;
Of day and night there was yet no distinction.
Alone that one breathed calmly, self-supported,
Other than it was none, nor aught above it.

Darkness there was at first in darkness hidden;
This universe was undistinguished water.
That which is void and emptiness lay hidden,
Alone by power of fervor was developed.

Then for the first time there arose desire,
Which was the primal germ of mind, within it.
And sages, searching in their heart, discovered
In nothing the connecting bond of being.

Who is it knows? Who here can tell us surely
From what and how this universe has risen?
And whether not till after it the gods lived?
Who, then, can know from what it has arisen?

The source from which this universe has risen
And whether it was made, or uncreated,
He only knows, who from the highest heaven
Rules—the all-seeing Lord— or does not He know?"

One naturally compares with these poetic speculations the beginning of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where we have a Roman poet's conception of the original chaos, a rude and confused mass of water, earth and air, all void of light, out of which "God and kindly nature" produced the visible order of beauty of the world. The old Scandinavians had also, in their sacred book, "The Elder Edda," a song of the prophetess, who told the story of creation:

Old Scandi-
navian Song.

"In that far age when Ymir lived,
And there was neither land nor sea,
Earth there was not nor lofty heaven;
A yawning deep but verdure none.
Until Bor's sons the spheres upheaved,
And formed the mighty midgard round;
Then bright the sun shone on the cliffs,
And green the ground became with plants."

I need not quote, but only allude to, the Chaldean account of creation, recently deciphered from the monuments, and the opening chapter of the book of Genesis, which contains what modern scholars are given to calling the "Hebrew poem of Creation." In this we have the sublime but vivid picture of God creating the heavens and the earth and all their contents and living tribes in six days and resting the seventh day and blessing it.

Chaldean Account of Creation.

As theologians we naturally study these theosophic poems with reference to their origin and relationship. But we now call attention to the place they hold in the sacred literatures of the world. Each composition bears the marks of an individual genius. He may, and probably does, in every case express the current belief or tradition of his nation, but his description reveals a human mind wrestling with the mysterious problems of the world, and suggesting, if not announcing, some solution. As specimens of literature the various poems of creation exhibit a world-wide taste and tendency to cast in poetic form the profoundest thoughts which busy the human soul.

I turn now to that great collection of ancient Indian songs known as the Rigveda. As a body of sacred literature, it is especially expressive of a childlike intuition of nature. The hymns are addressed to various gods of earth and air and the bright heaven beyond, but owing to their great diversity of date and authorship they vary much in value and interest. By the side of some splendid productions of gifted authors we find many tiresome and uninteresting compositions. It is believed by those best competent to judge that in the oldest hymns we have a picture of an original and primitive life of men just as it may be imagined to have sprung forth fresh and exultant from the bosom of nature. Popular songs always embody numerous facts in the life of a people, and so these Vedic hymns reveal to us the ancient Aryans at the time when they entered India, far back beyond the beginnings of authentic history. They were not the first occupants of that country, but entered it by the same northwestern passes where Alexander led his victorious armies more than two thousand years thereafter. The Indus and the rivers of the Punjab water the fair fields where the action of the Vedas is laid. The people cultivated the soil and were rich in flocks and herds. But they were also a race of mighty warriors, and with apparently the best good conscience prayed and struggled to enrich themselves with the spoil of the enemies. All these things find expression in the Vedic songs, and a popular use of them implies an ardent worship of nature.

The Rigveda.

The principal earth-god, to whom very many hymns are addressed, is Agni, the god of fire. His proper home is heaven, they say, but he has come down as a representative of other gods to bring light and comfort to the dwellings of men. His births are without number, and the vivid poetical concept of their nature is seen in the idea that he lies concealed in the soft wood, and when two sticks are rubbed together Agni springs forth in gleaming brightness and devours the sticks which were his parents. He is also born amid the rains of heaven and comes down as lightning to the earth.

Take the following as a fair specimen of many hymns of praise addressed to the god of fire:

To the God
of Fire.

"O, Agni, graciously accept this wood which I offer thee, and this my service, and listen to my songs. Herewith we worship thee, O, Agni, thou high-born, thou conqueror of horses, thou son of power. With songs we worship thee who lovest song, who givest riches and art Lord thereof. Be thou to us of wealth the Lord and giver, O, wise and powerful one; and drive away from us the enemies. Give us rains out of heaven, thou inexhaustible one; give us our food and drinks a thousand fold. To him who praises thee and seeks thy help, draw near, O, youngest messenger and noblest priest of the gods, draw near through song. O, thou wise Agni, wisely thou goest forth between gods and men, a friendly messenger between the two. Thou wise and honored one, occult, perform the sacrificial service and seat thyself upon this sacred grass."

As Agni is the principal deity of the earth, so is Indra of the air. He is the god of the clear blue sky, the air space, whence come the fertilizing rains. The numerous poems addressed to him abound in images which are said to be especially forcible to such as have lived some time in India and watched the phenomena of the changing seasons there. The clouds are conceived as the covering of hostile demons, who hide the sun, darken the world and hold back the heavenly waters from the thirsty earth. It is Indra's glory that he alone is able to vanquish those dreadful demons. All the other gods shrink back from the roaring monsters, but Indra, armed with his fatal thunderbolt, smites them with rapid lightning strokes, ruins their power, pierces their covering of clouds and releases the waters which then fall in copious showers to bless the earth. In other hymns the demons are conceived as having stolen the reservoirs of water and hidden them away in the caverns of the mountains. But Indra pursues them thither, splits the mountains with his thunderbolt and sets them at liberty again. Such a powerful deity is also naturally worshiped as the god of battle. He is always fighting and never fails to conquer in the end. Hence he is the ideal hero whom the warrior trusts and adores.

"On him all men must call amid the battle;
He, high adored, alone has power to succor.
The man who offers him prayers and libations,
Him Indra's arm helps forward in his goings."

With Indra other divinities of the air realm are associated, as Vata, the god of the wind, who arises in the early morning to drink the soma juice and lead in the dawn; Rudra's sons, the Maruts, gods of the thunderstorm. Where in all the realm of lyric poetry can be found compositions more charming than the Vedic hymns to Aurora, the goddess of the dawn? She opens the gates of day, drives away darkness, clears a pathway on the misty mountain tops and sweeps along in glowing brightness with her white steeds and beautiful chariot. All nature springs to life as she approaches, and beasts and birds and men go forth with joy.

The sacred scriptures of Buddhism comprise three immense collections known as the Tripitaka, or "three baskets." One of these contains the discourses of Buddha, another treats of doctrines and metaphysics, and another is devoted to ethics and discipline. In bulk these writings rival all that was ever included under the title of Veda, and contain more than seven times the amount of matter in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The greater portion of this extensive literature, in the most ancient texts, exists as yet only in manuscript. But as Buddhism spread and triumphed mightily in southern and eastern Asia, its sacred books have been translated into Pali, Burmese, Siamese, Tibetan, Chinese and other Asiatic tongues. The Tibetan edition of the Tripitaka fills about 325 folio volumes. Every important tribe or nation which has adopted Buddhism appears to have a more or less complete Buddhist literature of its own. But all this literature, so vast that one lifetime seems insufficient to explore it thoroughly, revolves about a comparatively few and simple doctrines. First we have the four sublime verities: First, all existence, being subject to change and decay, is evil; second, the source of all this evil is desire; third, desire and the evil which follows it may be made to cease; fourth, there is a fixed and certain way by which to attain exemption from all evil. Next after these verities are the doctrines of the eightfold path: First, right belief; second, right judgment; third, right utterance, fourth, right motives; fifth, right occupation; sixth, right obedience; seventh, right memory, and eighth, right meditation. Then we have further, five commandments: First, do not kill; second, do not steal, third, do not lie; fourth, do not become intoxicated; fifth, do not commit adultery. The following passage is a specimen of the tone and style of Buddha's discourses:

"The best of ways is the eightfold; the best of truths the four words; the best of virtues passionlessness; the best of men he who has eyes to see. This is the way; there is no other that leads to the purifying of intelligence. Go on this way. Everything else is the deceit of the tempter. If you go on this way you will make an end of pain. The way was preached by men when I had understood the thorns of the flesh. You yourself must make an effort. The Buddha is only a preacher. The thoughtful that enter this way are freed from the bondage of the tempter. All created things perish; he who knows this becomes passive in pain; this is the way to purity. All created things are grief and pain; he who knows and does this becomes passive in pain, this is the way that leads to purity."

We who are reared under a western civilization can see little that is attractive in the writings of Buddhism. The genius of Edwin Arnold has set the story of the chief doctrines of Buddha in a brilliant dress in his poem of the "Light of Asia;" but the Buddhist scriptures as specimens of literature are as far removed from that poem as the Talmud from the Hebrew Psalter. Here and there a nugget of gold may be discovered, but the reader must pay for it by laborious toiling through vast spaces of tedious metaphysics and legend. It is

The Buddhist
Tripitaka.

Writings of
Buddhism.

worthy of note that, as Christianity originated among the Jews, but has had its chief triumphs among the Gentiles, so Buddhism originated among the Hindus, but has won most of its adherents among other tribes and nations.

Sacred Books
of Confucian-
ism.

Glance with me now a moment at the sacred books of Confucianism, which is par excellence the religion of the Chinese empire. But Confucius was not the founder of the religion which is associated with his name. He claimed merely to have studied deeply into antiquity and to be a teacher of the records and worship of the past. The Chinese classics comprise the five King and the four Shu. The latter, however, are the works of Confucius's disciples, and hold not the rank and authority of the five King. The word king means a web of cloth (or the warp which keeps the thread in place) and is applied to the most ancient books of the nation as works possessed of a sort of canonical authority. Of these ancient books the Shu King and the Shih King are of chief importance. One is a book of history and the other of poetry. The Shu King relates to a period extending over seventeen centuries, from about 2357 B. C. to 627 B. C., and is believed to be the oldest of all the Chinese Bible, and consists of ballads relating to events of the national history, and songs and hymns to be sung on great state occasions. They exhibit a primitive simplicity, and serve to picture forth the manners of the ancient time. The following is a fair example of the odes used in connection with the worship of ancestors. A young king, feeling his responsibilities, would fain follow the example of his father, and prays to him for help:

Ode to an An-
cestor.

"I take counsel, at the beginning of my rule,
How can I follow the example of my shrived father?
Ah! far-reaching were his plans,
And I am not able to carry them out.
However I endeavor to reach to them
My continuation of them will be all deflected.
I am a little child,
Unequal to the many difficulties of the state.
Having taken his place, I will look for him to go up and come down in
the court,
To ascend and descend in the house.
Admirable art thou, O, great Father;
Condescend to preserve and enlighten me."

It has been widely maintained and with much show of reason, that Confucianism is at best a system of ethics and political economy rather than a religion. Many a wise maxim, many a noble precept may be cited from the sacred books, but the whole system logically resolves itself into one of worldly wisdom rather than of spiritual life. Confucius says:

"When I was fifteen years old I longed for wisdom. At thirty my mind was fixed in pursuit of it. At forty I saw certain principles clearly. At fifty I understood the rule given by heaven. At sixty everything I heard I easily understood. At seventy the desires of my heart no longer transgressed the law."

In passing now from sacred literatures of the far east to those of

the west, I linger for a moment over the religious writings of the ancient Babylonians and the Persians. Who has not heard of Zoroaster and the Zend-Avesta? But the monuments of the great valley of the Tigris and Euphrates have in recent years disclosed a still more ancient literature. The old Akkadian and Assyrian hymns might be collected into a volume which would perhaps rival the Veda in interest, if not in value. I can only take time to cite an old Akkadian hymn to the setting sun, which seems to have been a portion of the Babylonian ritual:

"O sun, in the middle of the sky, at thy setting,
 May the bright gates welcome thee favorably;
 May the door of heaven be docile to thee;
 May the god director, thy faithful messenger, mark the way.
 In Ebara, seat of thy royalty, he makes thy greatness shine for thee.
 May the morn, thy beloved spouse, come to meet thee with joy;
 May thy heart rest in peace;
 May the glory of thy godhead remain with thee.
 Powerful hero, O sun! shine gloriously.
 Lord of Ebara, direct thy foot lightly in thy road.
 O sun, in making thy way, take the path marked for thy rays.
 Thou art the Lord of judgments over all nations."

Old Akkadian
Hymn.

As for the sacred scriptures of the Parsees, the Avesta, it may be said that few remains of antiquity are of much greater interest to the student of history and religion. But these records of the old Iranian faith have suffered sadly by time and the revolutions of the empire. One who has made them a special life study observes: "As the Parsees are the ruins of a people, so are their sacred books the ruin of a religion. There has been no other great belief that ever left such poor and meager monuments of its past splendor." The oldest portions of the Avesta consist of praises to the holy powers of heaven and invocations for them to be present at the ceremonial worship. The entire collection, taken together, is mainly of the nature of a prayer book or ritual.

We pass now to the land of Egypt, and notice that mysterious compilation of myth and legend, and words of hope and fear, now commonly known as the "Book of the Dead." It exists in a great number of manuscripts recovered from Egyptian tombs, and many chapters are inscribed upon coffins, mummies, sepulchral wrappings, statues and walls of tombs. Some of the tombs contain exactly the same characters, or follow the same arrangement. The text is accordingly very corrupt. The writing was not, in fact, intended for mortal eyes, but to be buried with the dead, and the prayers are, for the most part, language supposed to be used by the departed in their progress through the under world. We can, therefore, hardly expect to find in this strange book anything that will greatly interest us as literature. Its value is in the knowledge it supplies of the ancient Egyptian faith. The blessed dead are supposed to have the use of all their limbs, and to eat and drink, and to enjoy an existence similar to that which they had known on earth. But they are not confined to

any one locality, or to any one form of existence. They have the range of the entire universe in every shape and form which they desire. We find in one chapter an account of the terrible nature of certain divinities and localities which the deceased must encounter. This before gigantic and venomous serpents, gods with names significant of death and destruction, waters and atmospheres of flames. But none of these prevail over him; he passes through all things without harm, and lives in peace with the fearful gods who preside over these abodes. The following is a specimen of invocations to be used in passing through such dangers:

"O Ra, in thine egg, radiant in thy disk shining forth from the horizon, swimming over the steel firmament, sailing over the pillars of Shu: thou who hast no second among the gods, who produced the winds by the flames of thy mouth and who enlightenest the worlds with thy splendors, save the departed from that god whose nature is a mystery and whose eyebrows are as the arms of the balance on the night when Aanit was weighed."


The Moham-
medan Bible.

The Mohammedan Bible is a comparatively modern book. It is a question whether its author ever learned to read or write. He dictated his revelations to his disciples and they wrote them on date leaves, bits of parchment, tablets of white stone and shoulder blades of sheep. After the prophet's death the different fragments were collected and arranged according to the length of the chapters, beginning with the longest and ending with the shortest. As a volume of sacred literature the Koran is deficient in those elements of independence and originality which are noticeable in the sacred books of the other great religions of the world. It is a tedious book to read. It is full of repetition and seems incapable of happy translation into any other language. Its crowning glory is its glowing Arabic diction. Mohammed himself insisted that the marvelous excellence of his book was a standing proof of its superhuman origin. "If men and genii," says he, "united themselves together to bring the like of the Koran they could not bring the like, though they should back each other up."

Words of Sir
William Jones.

In view of the limit of my space and time, I purposed to omit particular notice of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. The New Testament is a unique book, or set of books, and the gospels and epistles constitute a peculiar literature. But as a body of rich and various literature these writings are surpassed by the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In giving the palm to the sacred books of the Hebrews, I will simply add the words of Sir William Jones, written on a blank leaf of his bible. That that distinguished scholar was a most competent critic and judge none will dispute. He wrote:

"I am of opinion that this volume, independently of its divine origin, contains more true sublimity, more exquisite beauty, more pure morality, more important history and finer strains of poetry and eloquence than can be collected from all other books in whatever age or language they may have been written."



Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D., Plainfield, N. J.

